The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1932 NUMBER 895

Contents

The Week 279

Editorials

What Kind of Inflation? 281
The Sordid Story of Foreign Bonds 282

General Articles

Britain for Cancellation ..... J. M. Keynes 284
The Revolt in the Corn Belt ..... Donald R. Murphy 285
Big Navy Boys: II ..... Charles A. Beard 287
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 291
Mycenae and Connecticut ..... Stark Young 293
A Hoosier Quixote ..... John Dos Passos 294
A Communication ..... Benjamin Ginzburg 296

Correspondence 297

Reviews of Books

The Last of Lyric Poets ..... Malcolm Cowley 299
The World at Work and Play ..... Sumner H. Slichter 300
Democritus Junior ..... Robert Morss Lovett 302
Mr. Clemens' Family ..... Percy H. Boynton 302
Book Notes 303

The Week

THE Japanese reply to Secretary Stimson is just what was to be expected. It is disingenuous, evasive, promises nothing, even hints that Japan may repudiate her obligations under the Nine Power Pact, and leaves the actual situation just where it was. Some American commentators, of whom Mr. James G. McDonald was, we believe, the first, attach much importance to that part of Mr. Stimson's note in which he said the United States will not recognize the validity of treaties by which Japan seeks to legalize the results of her acts in Manchuria, when these acts constitute a violation of her obligations under the Nine Power Treaty or the Kellogg Pact. Heretofore, a treaty has been a treaty, in international law. Once signed, it was legal, however obtained. Secretary Stimson's new policy is, so to speak, a way of putting ex-post-facto teeth into the Kellogg Pact, and, it is argued, may prove that document's most important provision, since fear of such developments might in the future act as a deterrent upon a Power contemplating a course similar to Japan's in Manchuria. Undoubtedly, there is something in this argument, though it is a melancholy deflation of the promises made to the world at the time the Kellogg Pact was signed. And in the specific case of Manchuria, it is for the present about as effective as saying to a man who has burned down his neighbor's house: "I refuse to take cognizance of the conflagration, and shall continue to send letters to the old address."

MEANWHILE, it is embarrassingly clear that Mr. Hoover and Secretary Stimson are rapidly getting beyond their depth in the dark waters of the Manchurian affair. Mr. Hoover has given the administration's blessing to the $616,000,000 Vinson naval bill. The last time we adopted a comprehensive naval building law was in 1916, when this country was preparing for war with Germany. A few weeks ago, the Navy announced the holding of winter maneuvers off Hawaii, and the announcement emphasized that for the first time in history all of America's battleships and battle cruisers would be concentrated in the Pacific. The most reasonable interpretation of these events is that the United States (in violation of the spirit of Article Two of the Kellogg Pact) is engaged in a direct attempt to bring armed pressure to bear upon Japan. If Mr. Hoover and Secretary Stimson persist in this course and Japan does not yield, we are likely to be faced with the bald choice of fighting or suffering a thumping diplomatic defeat. While it is undoubtedly true that what Japan is doing is a violation of the Nine Power Treaty, Mr. Stimson's note is likely to have an effect just the reverse of what he desired. The warlike Seiyukai party, now in office, is in a hopeless minority in the Japanese Diet, and a Japanese general election is due to be held within a few weeks. The note is certain to be used as campaign material for Seiyukai orators, and may even be the deciding influence in saving Japan's militarists from what might otherwise be a decisive defeat at the polls.

THE resignation of Mr. Justice Holmes reduces the permanent liberal minority of the Supreme Court to one—at least for the present. Regrettable as this is, no one can cavil at Justice Holmes' decision, in his ninety-first year, that he has now borne his fair share of the heat and burden of the day. Our readers know the esteem in which The New Republic holds him too well to make a re- statement of it necessary. His retirement brings

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a feeling of poignant loss which, for a time at least, proves that life has even deeper significances than the insistent worries of a depression. Judged by any standards, Oliver Wendell Holmes is not a typical American—removed as he has been for half a century from the hurly-burly of market place and politics, a philosopher who sees the daily strife and woe of men *sub specie aeternitatis,* a poet rather than a pedant in the law. His place in the hearts of his countrymen is well nigh unique in his generation, as are the qualities of intellect and character which have made him, beyond any possible cavil, the first citizen of his time.

MANY possible nominees for Mr. Justice Holmes' position have been thrust upon the attention of President Hoover. Some of them have a merit which is geographical, or political in other senses; some of them are good lawyers within the narrow meaning of that term. Mr. Hoover may have made his nomination before these lines appear in print; but whether he has or not, it is worth while to call attention to one surprising and reassuring fact. Without exception, so far as we can learn, those practitioners of the law who are best known for taking seriously the social responsibilities of their calling have united in suggesting Judge Benjamin Cardozo, Chief Justice of the New York State Court of Appeals, as the one obvious, inevitable person to take Justice Holmes' place. They have done so without knowing whether he would accept, solely on the ground that his abilities, character and knowledge make him uniquely fitted for the post. Few men, while still living, ever receive such a spontaneous and, in a sense, involuntary tribute from such a highly qualified group.

ON THE twenty-first of this month, arguments began in the State Supreme Court of Alabama in the cases of the eight Scottsboro boys. As readers of The New Republic are aware, the defense is now being handled solely by the International Labor Defense, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People having withdrawn, at least temporarily, from the case. Clarence Darrow and Arthur Garfield Hays, who had been retained by the latter organization, have also withdrawn from the case, suggesting that they were unable to work with the I.L.D. Though the withdrawal of the N.A.A.C.P. is in many respects to be regretted, it is not without its advantages. Henceforth the bitter quarrel which has raged between the two organizations fighting for the privilege of defending the boys, will take place on the side lines rather than on the field of battle itself, where, regardless of the arguments over priority rights in the case, eight Negro boys still face the possibility of being electrocuted for a crime which they almost certainly did not commit.

NORMAN THOMAS and Clarence Senior, on behalf of the Socialist party, have written an open letter to Congress, quoting two pages of what they say is a document put out last month by the Illinois National Guard, intended for the confidential perusal of its members. It is entitled "Emergency Plans for Domestic Disturbances," and its purpose is to tell the guardsmen just what to do in case of "radical disorders" or riots of any character. Among other instructions, it says that

> troops should never be ordered on riot duty without an ample supply of ball ammunition. Blank cartridges should never be fired at a mob. . . . When troops of the Illinois National Guard are ordered on active duty to suppress domestic disorders, UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WILL BLANK AMMUNITION BE ISSUED TO THEM.
>
> NEVER FIRE OVER THE HEADS OF RIOTERS. The aim should be low, with full charge ammunition and the battle sight. . . . Officers and men should not fear reprisal in case one or more people are killed. . . . Officers of troops aiding civil authorities should not permit the latter to indicate HOW THEIR DUTIES SHOULD BE PERFORMED. . . . When necessary, a few sharpshooters or expert riflemen may be placed on roofs and in high windows to fire over the heads of those in the front of a crowd and break up the rear.

Messrs. Thomas and Senior also quote passages suggesting that the guardsmen should call on the local chapters of the American Legion for assistance, and should invoke the aid of the Chamber of Commerce. Pointing out that local relief funds are almost exhausted, and that hunger riots seem likely this winter, they urge Congress to pass measures for federal relief and not leave the situation to those whose way of solving the problem is to shoot down the starving if they dare make organized demonstrations of protest.

BOTH William Hightower and W. B. Jones having now been sentenced to life imprisonment for counseling the death of a Harlan County deputy sheriff during the strike riot in Evarts last May, the situation of the other forty striking miners who are also charged with murder or conspiracy to murder becomes extremely grave. Funds raised by the General Defense Committee, the I. W. W. organization which is handling the case for the miners, have been almost depleted. The cost of the defense has been excessive, owing to the fact that it was necessary to transport witnesses 200 miles from Harlan County to Mt. Sterling, where the cases of Hightower, Jones and eight other union workers were taken on a change of venue. The prosecution was able to swamp the court with truckloads of witnesses, most of whom were mine guards in the employ of the Black Mountain Coal Company, while the defense was unable to make a similar display of evidence. Though Judge Prewitt has remanded the remaining cases back to Harlan County, this does not necessarily mean that they will be tried there, and the defense may again be forced to assume the burden of transporting its witnesses. At

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present the Defense Committee is still desperately in need of funds. Only four of the miners have been tried so far, forty more remain to be tried, and unless the Committee can raise more money to carry on the general expenses of defending the other miners, it is almost certain that they will follow Jones and Hightower to jail. An appeal for money has been issued by the General Defense Committee. Those interested in protecting the rights of the Harlan miners should send contributions to the Committee at 555 West Lake Street, Chicago.

WHILE the Senate ought to be busy about relief measures and taxation, it ought not to be so busy as to neglect its constitutional duty in the making of judges whose tenure will outlive the present depression. Disregard both for traditional American ideals and for tempers that befit judges marks President Hoover's nomination of Kenneth Mackintosh and Judge J. H. Wilkerson to the United States circuit courts of appeals. The recognition that vastly significant litigation is for all practical purposes finally determined by these courts requires close scrutiny of the men who, as judges, are entrusted with such large powers. One may hope for vision and statesmanship among judges, but one must demand proof of a fair-minded, tolerant spirit. Neither of President Hoover's candidates meets this minimum requirement. In 1919 Kenneth Mackintosh was a judge of the Supreme Court of Washington. Two days after the Centralia riot —which, as our readers will remember, began as a lynching bee directed by the local American Legion against a group of I. W. W.'s—with a knowledge that, as judge of that high court, prosecutions for grave crimes arising out of that affair would come before him, he gratuitously put upon record his "appreciation of the high character of citizenship displayed by the people of Centralia," and his pride in the "calm control and loyalty to American ideals" there demonstrated. It would seem that elementary fairness would lead a judge with such an inflamed mind to hold himself aloof from passing upon the guilt or innocence of the I. W. W. leaders whom he had so hysterically condemned. But not Judge Mackintosh. One finds him a year and a half later concurring with his brethren in finding these leaders guilty of murder. This morbid fear of radicalism and the foreign-born spoke out again only recently when Judge Mackintosh, as a member of the Wickersham Commission, refused to join the Commission in its condemnation of the high-handed practices of the Department of Labor in the enforcement of the deportation laws.

JUDGE Wilkerson is inextricably entangled with the issuance of the most outrageous labor injunction in the annals of American law. As a Harding-Daugherty appointee of a few weeks' standing, he lent the aid of his judicial office to Attorney General Daugherty to break the Railway Shopmen's strike of 1922. The Wilkerson restraining order, going far beyond any injunctive relief theretofore granted, was awarded without notice to the unions. From the procedure of its issuance, one is compelled to conclude that, without careful scrutiny of what he was signing, the pliant judge granted the prayer of an Attorney General conveyed in a voluminous document of some fifty pages. His latest bid for notoriety has been his handling of the Capone case. The sentence there inflicted, and the refusal to follow the customary procedure of allowing bail, hardly depict a judge indignant over income-tax invasion, but a federal judge, unmindful of his federal functions, hell-bent on cleaning up Chicago. When the American Bar Association, through its official journal, remarks that "least of all, is a conviction in a federal court for any offense to be taken as representing, *even indirectly,* a punishment for the crimes which the defendant may have committed against the State," did it have in mind Judge Wilkerson? In any event, the description fits.

What Kind of Inflation?

IMMINENT passage of the President's bill for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the apparent willingness of Congress to support the other and less important items of his program, have given rise to the belief that at last this country is started on a policy of limited inflation. It is rumored that the Federal Reserve Banks will help, perhaps by reducing the rediscount rate again and, what is more important, by pumping out credit with enlarged open-market purchases of government bonds and bankers' acceptances. This credit stimulation will, it is hoped, have a wholesome effect on production and trade, and force us around the corner into revival. The recent rise in the prices of stocks and bonds is by some attributed to the expectation of inflation—though a temporary recovery in the stock market is normal at this time of year, as a reaction from the year-end settlements.

On what ground is the expectation based that government loans to necessitous railroads, banks and insurance companies, combined with an expansionist Federal Reserve policy, will bring a business revival? The reasoning behind the policy is clear enough. It assumes that the way to stimulate production is by a renewal of capital investment and an expansion of short-term borrowing on the part of business. These movements have not occurred, so far, partly because confidence is lacking, and partly because the lending agencies have so much money tied up in "frozen assets." These assets, frozen on account of the low prices of bonds, mortgages and stocks, may be melted (a) if government loans to railroads and financial institutions remove the fear of default, and (b) if Federal Reserve and other bank buying raises the prices of securities in the market. The basic assumptions are, therefore, that the low prices of securities are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

situation but will permanently vanish if a stimulus is applied, and that there are plenty of projects for private business expansion waiting to go ahead, which require only the necessary capital and credit. If these assumptions are not true, the stimulation about to be applied will cause at best only a temporary increase in security prices, to be followed later by another collapse. And the relaxation of capital and credit resources will not cause business to utilize more money in expanded production, since business will not have the necessary markets for its product.

There are strong reasons for believing that the assumptions in question are mistaken. The fear of default or of permanently reduced capital return, which has kept security prices low, may be well justified. Dr. Frederick C. Mills' study of the course of prices, made for the National Bureau of Economic Research, shows that between July, 1929, and October, 1931, the general average of wholesale prices went down 30.2 percent in the United States. Is there any reason for supposing that, if this represents a permanent change to a new price level, the prices of securities and real property can escape a similar deflation? The price reduction, moreover, has not occurred equally in all types of commodities. It has been far more marked in farm products and raw materials than in manufactured goods, and goods processed for human consumption. It has been far more marked in wholesale prices than in retail prices. The depression, up to October, had decreased the purchasing power of raw materials 13.4 percent per unit, and of raw farm products 24.8 percent; while it had increased the real prices, or purchasing power per unit of manufactured goods, 6.1 percent. These divergences in value obstruct the exchange of goods. It is quite possible that permanent recovery cannot take place unless either prices of manufactured goods and articles sold at retail come down within hailing distance of farm products and raw materials, or prices of farm products and raw materials come up within hailing distance of manufactured goods and retail prices.

Now, if prices are to be evened down, two results are to be expected with regard to capital obligations. First, farm mortgages must suffer permanent losses, which must be written off by banks and insurance companies. Second, the further fall of prices of manufactured and retailed goods will necessitate the writing down of fixed charges in industry, transportation and city real estate, which are important elements in the cost of manufacture and distribution. Unless, therefore, there is in sight a marked upward movement in the prices of products and raw materials, a considerable amount of permanent deflation of capital would seem unavoidable. Government and banking stimulation of capital markets cannot avert it. The government cannot go on paying interest which is not earned. Manufacturers, no matter how much for expanded production until after their fixed charges are permanently lowered and their selling prices further reduced.

If this analysis is correct, the only possible alternative to the rounding out of deflation by a reduction of capital values is not, therefore, action which is calculated first of all to sustain these values, but action which promptly results in an expansion of production and trade, and thus grants time and a possible stimulus for an increase of prices in farm products and other commodities. Such action can be taken by government through a sufficiently large expansion of expenditure for public works, and government relief of the unemployed. Government does not have to wait for a revival of markets in order to spend money for materials, equipment and labor, since what it produces is not for sale. And money received by the unemployed is immediately spent in a way which expands markets. The business activity which government spending of this type would stimulate, directly and indirectly, would be enormous. This would be a truly inflationist measure. It would help to advance commodity and farm prices. The increases of production which would result would really aid confidence in all markets. Even this, of course, might not be sufficient; we might find in the end that capital values had to come down anyway. But at least it would be applying inflation in such a way as to stimulate, first of all, the prices which had suffered most, and not to keep up the very prices which are, relatively, too high.

The Sordid Story of Foreign Bonds

THE EVIDENCE being brought out by the Finance Committee of the United States Senate in the investigation of the post-war flotation of foreign securities in the United States is sordid almost beyond belief. It has already impeached the honor as well as the judgment of our leading bankers who negotiated excessive foreign loans, $815,000,000 of which, according to Mr. Otto Kahn's testimony, are already in default. Our bankers by their own admission stand convicted of having disregarded patent facts and repeated warnings, oftentimes from their own experts, of having bribed foreign government officials and of having deliberately deceived American investors by presenting half-truths or by concealing facts which investors had a right to be told.

It is common knowledge that for some time past our Department of State has been using international finance as an instrument of national policy, particularly to further our imperialistic plans in the five Caribbean republics over which we exercise an effective protectorate. It is common knowledge that the Department of State has often employed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our debt-refunding agreements. But not until Mr. Stimson testified before the Senate Committee were we aware that an American Secretary of State had used his high office to persuade the National City Bank of New York to grant an unsound bank credit to the government of Colombia as a means of obtaining one of the world's largest oil concessions for a company controlled by the interests of Mr. Mellon, our Secretary of the Treasury.

The problems of our foreign investments must be considered in the light of two important facts: First, these investments were indispensable if our war-created credits and our tariff policy were to be maintained. Second, under the capitalistic system the principal means of protecting society against anti-social practices may be called the enforcement of adequate laws against deceit and fraud.

As a result of war financing, we changed our position on international balance from that of a net debtor by about three billion dollars on July 31, 1914, to that of a net creditor by about fourteen billion dollars on December 31, 1919. Since 1919 Europeans have purchased large quantities of our goods which we were just as eager to sell to them. At the same time we have been unwilling to accept European goods or services in payment of both our current exports and our interest dues from foreigners. During the eleven years between 1920 and 1930, we received $9,896,000,000 in income on our foreign investments and paid to foreigners $2,632,000,000 on their investments in this country. Thus we received a net investment income of $7,264,000,000. During the same period we increased our net foreign investments by $7,771,000,000. We took our interest income in foreign investments instead of foreign goods or services. Our bankers made large profits on this traffic in foreign investments, as their testimony now shows. We must remember however, that although our bankers have made a crooked racket of foreign financing, it is no less true that the exigencies of our war-debt and tariff policies, taken in combination, have been equally dishonest.

As for the merchandising of foreign investments, which bankers sell with far less moral, civil or criminal liability than horse dealers sell horses, it is evident that society's protection lies mainly in the enforcement of adequate laws against deceit and fraud. In this respect, selling foreign investments differs little from selling domestic securities, except that it is less regulated by government. As a step toward a more effective regulation of the sale of foreign securities, the government might make the concealment of facts a prison offense and require bankers to answer and publish questionnaires on foreign securities entering into interstate commerce.

The three series of Peruvian bonds, totaling a hundred millions, now in default, might not have been sold so readily if the banking syndicates had been obliged to publish the fact that they were paying half a million dollars in graft to the son of the President of Peru. It is doubtful whether the partners and directors of J. and W. Seligman and Company; the National City Company of New York; Blyth, Witter and Company; the Guaranty Company of New York; F. J. Lisman and Company, and the Central Union Trust Company would have cared to admit publicly that they were members of the original purchasing group which bribed the son of the President of Peru.

The suggestion has been made that a sort of laboratory be created to pass on new foreign securities. Such a laboratory, as Dr. W. W. Cumberland has suggested, might collect fees for its appraisals of securities. Others have suggested a banker-controlled organization to pass on new security offerings. It seems evident that no private organization can ever be sufficiently independent of banker dictation to make disinterested evaluations of credit factors.

Moreover, the fact remains that investment is an art and not a science. There are no valid criteria for appraising securities other than standards eliminating deceit and fraud. There can never be a science of guessing the future behavior of human beings. A Bolivian mine or a Brazilian government bond might prove a better investment than the stock of a New York City bank or a Liberty bond, given a certain course of events. It is of the essence of the capitalistic system that investors must guess for themselves. The investor's government, however, can protect him against fraud and provide him with information on which to base judgments or guessing.

In so far as public opinion can be made to correct the evils exposed by Senator Johnson's investigation, this must be largely the work of independent leaders, agencies and publications. If this investigation teaches the American public anything, it should be the lesson that the people must look to independent leaders and publications, even for investment guidance. Certainly the "expert" advice dispensed by persons subsidized by the sellers of investments is almost inevitably opposed to the best interest of investors. Investors must cease to repose confidence in sellers who have made a fine art of misleading their customers.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1932, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK ALVIN JOHNSON
E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES
R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain for Cancellation

GERMANY today is in the grip of the most terrible deflation that any nation has experienced. A visitor to that country is offered an extraordinary example of what the effects of such a policy can be, carried out to the limit. Indeed, the position is worse than a mere deflation need create. For a deflation might generally be expected to lower costs relatively to foreign costs and thereby assist exports. But in this case it is combined with a strangling exchange control which, by maintaining the mark at a fancy figure (fourteen and a half marks to the pound) in relation to the currencies of the non-gold countries, has simultaneously raised the relative cost of German goods in foreign markets and is thus destroying her trade. The result reaches or goes beyond the limit of what is endurable. Nearly a third of the population is out of work. The standards of life of those still employed have been cruelly curtailed. There is scarcely a manufacturer or a merchant in the country who is not suffering pecuniary losses which must soon bring his business to a standstill. The export trades, until recently so flourishing, are rapidly losing their foreign orders. Parents see no careers or openings for their offspring. The growing generation is without the normal incentives of bourgeois security and comfort.

Hamburg, living in a stupor, with many miles of ships laid up silent in its harbor and the elaborate traffic control of a great city but no traffic to be seen, is a symbol of Germany under the great deflation: a worse visitation, if it is to be continued, than ever the great inflation was a few years ago. Germany today, still spick and span as ever, is like a beautiful machine at a standstill ready to spring to life at the press of a button, and meanwhile inanimate. But while the machine sleeps, its crew cannot sleep.

We need to have an imaginative apprehension of all this. The reparations problem has become a matter of human feeling, of deep popular gusts of passion and consequently of very simple reactions and decisions. It is high time for the "experts" to leave the room.

If they have ever contributed anything, they have nothing further to contribute. It is a moment for the statesmen of the world to handle the matters which they are supposed to understand, namely, to record in set terms the unreflecting but absolute decisions of the common mind.

Has not the time come to invoke the power of simple ideas which all can understand? It is not worth while to send the "experts" into closets to calculate whether there may not be conceivable circumstances in which someone could pay sixpence some day. I am sure that it is the will of the British people, felt today with rare force and unanimity, that their government should stand openly and with determination for the total cancellation of reparations and war debts. We should not be disturbed by the fact that England has in the main already made its own contribution of generosity to the appeasement of the world and that the paper sacrifices now asked for—for that is all they are—are mostly from others, though if there is anything further which can be justly asked of us we should concede it. The country wants the Prime Minister to take up a stand beside Italy in support of Dr. Brüning's appeal.

This should be Great Britain's declared policy. But it need not be incompatible with a respect for the diplomatic difficulties and for the difference of pace with which the public sentiments of the countries concerned are moving. There has been some discussion with the French of a prospect of a moratorium of two or three years and some sort of another Dawes Committee at the end of it. The City views this expedient with hostility and alarm and I believe that the City for once is right. In any event, it would be impossible for the German Chancellor, in the face of the present vehemence of opinion in his own country, even to discuss it. If this policy were to be pressed it could only end in a total repudiation by Germany of all future liability. We must set our faces invincibly toward a final settlement within the present year.

Nevertheless, there would be immense advantages to the world in an agreed settlement over against a forced universal default. It is worth while to exercise the utmost patience and all the arts and usages of conciliation and political wisdom. It would even be worth while, in spite of what I have just said about the sixpences, for Germany to agree and for England to urge Germany to agree to pay modest and reasonable sums hereafter, if it was clear that this would make a settlement possible. But this does not mean that the position is ripe for a final settlement at Lausanne this month or next. There are several reasons why this is almost certainly impossible. Europe is seething with pure politics and so is America. In England all is plain for the time being, but abroad the political kaleidoscope is such as to make any observer dizzy. In particular, with elections both in France and in Prussia only a few weeks off, we may be sure that statesmen of neither country can make today those concessions which they may feel in their hearts to be wise and may have the authority to put over a few months hence. Moreover, opinion all over the world is advancing with seven-league boots, but it is not equally advanced. Time and the silent pressure of events are still doing good work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It happens that a short adjournment is singularly easy without raising any fundamental problems. Under the Hoover moratorium, Germany is due to commence making payments on July 15 next, but the war-debt payments to America do not recommence until December 15. Thus it is possible to extend the moratorium to Germany by five months without bringing to a head our own position *vis-à-vis* America. The decisions to be taken at Lausanne might therefore take the form, first, of a promise from the Allies to make to Germany within the present year a precise and definite proposal for the final determination of her liabilities, together with any further concessions which they are able to offer to make her task easier and more palatable and to bring the war atmosphere to an end with a shake of the hand and a sincere offer of friendship; second, of an agreement to watch the development of the economic crisis for a further six months before making this offer; and third, with these objects in view, of an extension of Germany's moratorium to December 15 and an adjournment of the Conference for six months.

London (by cable). J. M. KEYNES.

The Revolt in the Corn Belt

THERE was an armed revolt of farmers in western Massachusetts in 1786. Money was scarce, taxes and debts were burdens, farm-product prices were low. Shay's rebels fought and froze for one winter in the Massachusetts hills.

There was a political revolt among farmers in the eighties and nineties. Money was scarce, taxes and debts were heavy burdens, farm-product prices were low. The Farmers' Alliance took over the government of a dozen states; the Populists added a few more. Weaver got a million votes for President. The wave of revolt almost carried Bryan to the presidency in 1896.

Today money is scarce, taxes and debts are heavy burdens, farm-product prices are low. An observer is bound to remember Shay's Rebellion and the Populist revolt. He is bound to wonder whether we may look for direct action, for a political revolt, or whether the farm protest will expire in a dozen futile movements and end with the erstwhile revolters voting a straight ticket in 1932.

I am not sure, but I have been looking around. Something seems to be brewing. Look at Iowa, the richest, the most conservative of farm states. In the Populist outbreak, only 5 percent of its voters were for its own son, General Weaver, in the campaign of 1892. In the face of hard times following the crash of 1920, it turned down La Follette for Coolidge in 1924. In the face of the rebuff given by Hoover to its pet McNary-Haugen bill, it voted Republican heavily in 1928.

It remains the most conservative of farm states. Yet queer things are happening in Iowa. Queerer things are happening in other states, but be safe and look at Iowa only. Whatever happens of a radical tinge in Iowa can be multiplied by five or ten for other states.

Last fall 1,800 Iowa militia detrained at Tipton, a little county seat town in eastern Iowa. They encamped at the fair grounds, spread patrols over the county, mounted machine guns at crossroads, Under military escort, veterinarians administered the tuberculin test to herds of cows.

What was the military expedition about? The basic cause was twenty-cent corn and three-cent hogs. The immediate cause was objection to the tuberculin test. A state law provides for compulsory testing for tuberculosis. Animals which reacted to the test were slaughtered. The state and county pay one-third of the value; the federal government another third; the farmer stands the balance.

Some Cedar County farmers objected. They claimed the test was imperfect; that their cows aborted after being tested; that veterinarians were dictatorial, unclean. At their mass meetings these protesting farmers spoke of Bunker Hill and Lexington. They rallied like Minutemen when the alarm was sounded along the party line. They hurled stones and mud at deputies and veterinarians. At one farm a deputy, with drawn revolver, drew a deadline; a farm boy drew himself up like a corn-belt Nathan Hale and marched across it; the deputy did not fire.

Sheriffs and deputies were helpless. The Governor argued for months with the objectors and tried to obtain a peaceable settlement. Finally he sent the troops in, and sent plenty, so as to make it evident to everybody that resistance would be futile.

Up in Wright County, in early winter, there was advertised a sheriff's sale. A farmer had failed to meet his notes. Eight hundred farmers gathered. One man tried to bid. He was suppressed. No sale was held.

In Hardin County, the treasurer announced (as was his duty) a sale of tax certificates early in December. If a farmer, or anybody else, doesn't pay his taxes, anyone can bid in the taxes and eventually take possession of the property. The owner has three years to redeem. Farmers gathered and agreed that the folks whose taxes were delinquent should have sixty days more to try to raise the money. There was no bidding. The same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What will happen as the winter goes on and more tax sales, more foreclosure sales, are in order? "Refuse to pay taxes; refuse to pay interest; but hold the land," some farmers are saying. A general movement like this is all against the traditions of the state. Yet one wonders.

This is one form which the farm protest is taking. The other is the more familiar form of protest meetings. Drive into any county-seat town last fall, and there would be lights burning in the courthouse. Fords would be parked thick around the square. Go up in the courtroom and you'd find the air thick with the smell of damp clothes and sweat. The men had come from chores. The meetings rarely got started until nine. They went on and on interminably.

Everybody had his say. There were accusations against county and school officials for extravagance. There were attacks on Wall Street and, closer home, on local bankers. There were denunciations of the grain trade, the stock exchange, the Chicago Board of Trade.

At one such meeting, a stooped old fellow with a long gray beard shuffled to the front, slapped his hat on the platform and cried shrilly at the crowd:

"By God, you fellows are saying now what I've been saying for twenty years. I'm glad to see you're waking up. I've always told you the system would get you and, by the eternal, now it has."

It was the village socialist come into his own at last.

What these men saw was the stern face of disaster. They had suffered one deflation in 1920, had picked up the pieces and tried to go on again. Farming had been in a depression since 1920. Now, apparently, it was diving for new levels. It had been hard enough to hold on after the 1920 deflation, but how could anybody pay debts and taxes with the twenty-cent corn and three-cent hogs of 1931?

Nobody had an answer. One thousand meetings pled for a hundred remedies. The equalization fee, 3-percent money from the government, a corn-holding movement, a state income tax, reduction of county offices, lowering of salaries, lowering the tariff, were some of them. Gradually, however, a steady refrain began to develop—stable money, the Honest Dollar.

Now the Honest Dollar movement is a polite name for inflation, or as Mr. Hoover, just as politely, expressed it, "reversal of the processes of deflation." Just the same, it is an accurate name. A farmer who borrowed $1,000 in 1929 knows well enough that only a dishonest dollar would swell so much by 1931 that it would take three times as much corn to pay off the debt as the thousand dollars would have bought in 1929.

The old greenbackers, the silver men and the bewhiskered survivors of '92 and '96 sniffed the spring. I don't know whether they will be the battle from afar. This time, conservative bankers, men came in to back them up. Iowa's delegations to the great farm-organization conventions this fall and winter were solid for inflation "to the 1926 level." They came back with endorsements from the Farmers' Union, the Grange and the Farm Bureau.

This farm power will center around a bill that will instruct the Reserve Board to use its powers to restore the price level to the 1926 point and stabilize it there. It will specify open-market operations and handling of rediscount rates as means to that end. It will probably provide for reducing the legal minimum on gold reserves if that is necessary.

This will be the conservative bill. There are plenty of others, one by Burtness of North Dakota that cuts down the amount of gold in the dollar to get immediate inflation and that would keep the price level steady thereafter by daily infinitesimal changes in the weight of gold behind the dollar, these changes to be based on the shift in the general commodity price level. There is the bill of Senator Brookhart, which defines a dollar as "1/360,000,000,000 of the national wealth as of July 1, 1931."

The farm forces are trying hard to stay conservative enough so that their bill will get the approval of all groups and will escape a presidential veto. But if their conservative bill fails, the greenback boys will go out with their torches and do their best to start a prairie fire roaring by next fall.

What will happen? Many farmers are sullen and skeptical. "Legislation can't help. We've got to do it ourselves." They talk of Minutemen and a forced moratorium on debts and taxes.

Some want a stronger bill. "Give the government back its power to issue currency. Issue greenbacks for a labor-farm-relief program."

Some are convinced the Honest Dollar bill is the one life-saving idea that can help agriculture and, with agriculture, all other business. There is a fanatical zeal in their eyes as they harangue neighbors and threaten congressmen.

Some are making threats against the extra five dollars a month the local school teacher gets and the mileage rate the sheriff receives. They are wrapped up in local tax-cutting campaigns.

Nobody can tell what will happen in the Corn Belt in 1932. The cotton farmers may go radical; they did once in the eighties. The wheat farmers may go radical; they do it regularly every few years. But in the Corn Belt, the conservatives have held sway. Yet Corn Belt folks, like everybody else, have been deflated almost as much in the eleven years since 1920 as the wild men of 1896 had been in the thirty-two years following 1865.

If the Honest Dollar bill goes through this winter, the Corn Belt will be conservative again. If it doesn't, there may be fires on the prairies in fires of Shay's Rebellion or of the Populist revolt.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Big Navy Boys

II: *What Is a Naval Expert and Why?*

IN ALL the current discussions of naval defense there springs to the front that new creature of modern civilization, "the naval expert," with his portfolio of data, who proceeds on the assumption that the great issues at stake can be easily settled by a display of mathematical tables, graphs and comparative statistics. His brow wreathed with assurance, this facile specialist informs the gaping lay public in imperious tones that the business of providing "adequate naval armaments" is a question of physics and mathematics. To solve the problem, all that is necessary is the right experts and the right data. The former can be supplied by the Navy Department, self-constituted patriotic societies such as the Navy League and the Daughters of the American Revolution, and journalistic specialists in "naval affairs" such as the late William B. Shearer.

The data, according to this hypothesis, consist of statistics on the several types of warcraft, tonnage, gun range and caliber, naval bases, commercial lines, merchant-marine auxiliaries and similar matters susceptible of mathematical measurements. And it is taken for granted that the destructive efficiency of fighting units as against enemy units is a known or discoverable factor, whatever may be the capacity of the commander and his men or the conditions of combat in the unknown and unfathomable future. In other words, the problem of naval reduction or increase is one for specialists to solve: let them get their blue-prints together, decide how many of each type of craft and apparatus the country is to have and, presto, the solution is at hand.

Unfortunately, however, the problem is not so simple as this; nor can it be so neatly isolated and insulated for treatment. It is a "stubborn and irreducible" truth of natural science, established as far beyond debate as anything known to modern man, that tools, implements, machines and chemical substances will operate as calculated by their projectors and managers only when all the factors of material significance have been taken into the reckoning—that is, when no important factors of upsetting capacity are left out of the picture. The fundamental question before those who consider the armament issue, then, is this: do mathematical measurements of the fighting units and naval factors of the respective countries involved in negotiations automatically provide inescapable solutions to the whole array of problems presented? If they do, then the government of the United States, in considering naval armaments, merely has before it a complicated problem in mathematics, complicated yet possible of solution by mathematical competence.

But if other things than fighting-unit statistics must enter into calculations, then we must inquire what they are and, as far as humanly possible, get a scientifically accurate picture of the total situation as a basis for decision and action.

To state the question is to answer it. When we have before us the mathematical measurements of the existing and proposed fighting units of the respective countries, we do not have before us all the inescapable factors of the total situation. An elementary knowledge of history, of national policies, of commerce, of national psychology, of variables in past wars, of possibilities and potentialities in future wars and of variables in statesmanship and military command, is sufficient to destroy the validity of the simple statistical hypothesis of armaments. Not even the most rigidly scientific advocate of the mathematical process would claim that in his calculations he has before him all the inescapable data of the situation or that the infallibility of the statistical method here is beyond question.

That other elements besides the mathematics of fighting units enter into the calculations of experts who participate in the discussion of naval armament is made clear in the "Study of Naval Building Programs," issued for release to the morning papers, on September 4, 1931, by the Navy League of the United States. Although the document is made up principally of statistical tables and statements of alleged facts, it presents certain "general conditions" which deserve minute analysis in any study of the problem in hand. Here is an unofficial paper which purports to represent the "expert" opinion of a group of American citizens competent to speak authoritatively.

Let us consider the "general conditions" which lie outside the mathematical realm. First of all, the document states:

> It will be recalled that for years there has been a campaign of propaganda against capital ships, emanating originally from England and carried on in the United States mainly by anti-navalists. In this the principal alleged purpose is to relieve the world of the "colossal cost" of about $39,000,000 each for these "monster ships" by reducing their size or ultimately eliminating them.

This is a typical Navy League statement with respect to both facts and insinuations. It declares that the propaganda against capital ships eman-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but neither the Navy League nor anybody else can prove it. There has long been opposition to capital ships in various countries, based on the belief that in an age of submarines, airplanes, torpedoes and swift cruisers they are an expensive luxury that adds nothing to the efficiency of offense or defense. On the matter experts differ. The idea may have emanated first from England, but no historian has established that fact yet. Apparently the Navy League intends to insinuate that the whole movement is a bit of English propaganda. If so, that is an over-simplification of the case. Its purpose must be to discredit opposition to capital ships on the part of American citizens. That may be propaganda, but it is not science.

Undoubtedly Great Britain had reason to fear the growth of the American navy and welcomed an opportunity to check the construction of American capital ships. On the other hand there were many independent officials and citizens in the United States who feared the consequences of unrestrained rivalry with England and also welcomed an opportunity to reach a compromise. Considered with respect to her former position of dominance, England's action in accepting parity in capital ships was as great a sacrifice as that of the United States—to say the least. To insinuate that those Americans who advocated coming to terms with England were the victims of English propaganda is to travel beyond the realm of fact and resort to allegation and assumption. Yet this is thoroughly characteristic of the methods pursued by the Navy League, headed by gentlemen who have been reckoned, in some circles at least, as high-minded and interested above all in truth.

Other statements by the Navy League also present logical and scientific difficulties. In the summary for the press released on September 4, 1931, it says: "The United States lacks Britain's advantages of coastal trade lines and plentiful naval bases, for American trade lines run across oceans. American vessels, therefore, must be large enough to function at long distances from home." A part of this contention is definite; a part is difficult to fathom. American vessels must be large enough to function. How? Against whom? To what end? In what situations? They must function at long distances from home. What distances, measured in miles, and for how long a time? Until such a bill of specifications is made out, how can a mathematical formulation of tonnage and units be effected?

On this point there seems to be a break in the chain of the Navy League's reasoning. It proceeds on the hypothesis that the American navy is to be efficient enough to safeguard the transoceanic commerce of the United States and to extinguish fires where they are likely to break out—in the Euro-Asian-African region. Yet its actual building

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the direction of maintaining the "relative" strength of the American navy. In other words, we should, on the one hand, be prepared for the gigantic task of safeguarding commerce and extinguishing fires everywhere, anywhere, any time; and on the other hand are to be content with "relative strength," a limited strength that makes it possible for several potential combinations of powers to outmatch us and overpower us in any measurements of units and types. Evidently this creates an intellectual dilemma for any patriot trying to think his way through the complex situation to a tangible end.

The main point of this discussion, however, is not now to determine the soundness of the Navy League's respective propositions, but to show that they are crudely formulated, loosely stated, and possess no savor of scientific precision. In laying down the policies upon which the mechanics of naval defense must rest, the League employs the turgid rhetoric of politics, and its most brilliant assertions bear the marks of sophomoric sociology. At all events, in the field of naval "opinion," the League does not display any expertness, if it can lay any claim to this quality. As far as its statistics on trade, tonnage, guns, submarines and other matters are concerned, any good office clerk, with government data at hand, could make an equal show of technical knowledge after a few days of computation and tabulation. It is, therefore, difficult to escape the conclusion that the vocal directors of the League are well meaning and amiable gentlemen whose acquaintance with the history of warfare is slight, whose knowledge of the English language is deficient and whose capacity for exact expression is not equal to their faculty with the use of the adding-machine.

Whenever the question of naval limitation or appropriations for naval purposes comes up for consideration, the country is drenched with propaganda in favor of immense increases in expenditures for armaments. This much is certain. But no scientific study has yet been made of this sociological phenomenon. Indeed, the prime sources of information as to the origins and financing of this big-navy barrage have long been hidden from public view. At last, however, glimpses behind the scenes are possible, for the Senate investigation into the activities of Mr. W. B. Shearer at the Geneva Conference in 1927, as a representative of shipbuilding corporations, produced a huge volume of testimony bearing directly upon the subject of naval propaganda.[1] From the data thus developed the principal types of activity carried on and the methods adopted by interested parties in support of a bigger navy and merchant marine can be accurately described.

[1] Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate, Seventy-first Congress, first session, pursuant to S. Res. 114 (Washington, 1930), here cited as "Sen. Doc."

Broadly speaking, the Shearer types of propaganda activity were four in number. The first consisted of promotion work in connection with merchant-marine and navy legislation, for which Mr. Shearer was engaged in the autumn of 1926. Mr. Shearer himself testified that his contract called upon him "to use my best efforts in the interest of the three-cruiser bill which was pending in Congress, as you know, and under the law, unless sufficient money was appropriated, the bill would die in June."

Mr. Shearer's second undertaking for the associated industries was in connection with the Geneva Arms Conference of 1927. For this he was paid $25,000. As to the exact type of activity which he was to carry on, his employers were exceedingly vague in their testimony, if not in their minds. They agreed that he was to act as a kind of "observer" and to report "trends" in the Conference, but they denied that they had in view any kind of propaganda bearing on a big navy for the United States. His reports to them, however, and news items on him in the press at the time, would have made it clear to them, if they had kept track of his doings, that he was no mere observer at the Conference, but was exceedingly active in entertaining, giving out news stories and advocating views favorable to the development of a large American navy.

At all events, after the nature of Mr. Shearer's activities at Geneva had been widely broadcast so that any intelligent reader of the daily press could have known about them, certain of his employers reëngaged him in 1928 to take part in propaganda for mercantile-marine legislation. This was after the industrial combination that sent him to Geneva had definitely terminated its agreement with him by formal note, telling him that anything he had done at Geneva besides "observe" had been on his own responsibility.

A third line of attack adopted by Mr. Shearer was political—issuing a formal open letter in reply to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler's critical review of a part of Herbert Hoover's acceptance speech dealing with the navy and merchant marine, and preparing other propaganda papers sent out under the auspices of the Republican National Committee Publicity Bureau. For this work funds were provided by Mr. Wilder, of the American Brown Boveri Company, of which the New York Shipbuilding Company was a branch. These pieces of literature were designed to cast reflections on the patriotism and intelligence of peace advocates, to forward the demand for a big navy and merchant marine, to catch the Irish vote by criticism of Great Britain and to engage the interest of towns, particularly Boston, which had navy yards, shipbuilding yards or large shipping enterprises.

Mr. Shearer's fourth campaign of publicity was carried on under the auspices of Mr. Hearst, after he had been "separated" from the pay roll of the industrial corporations. On the new pay roll, he received $2,000 a month. This was for writing articles, mimeographing, speaking and organizing the patriotic societies, principally against the League of Nations and the World Court (*Sen. Doc.*, p. 540). He testified: "So, I immediately started to send out my bulletins to the patriotic organizations of the United States, and they immediately started sending in their resolutions opposing the World Court."

Speaking summarily, for what purposes were expenditures made out of the contributions from great manufacturing corporations which in the natural course of things could and did expect to make money out of merchant-marine and naval construction?

1. For the employment of an "observer" at the Geneva Arms Conference, who, whatever the terms of the "oral contract" under which he was hired, was notoriously engaged in violent anti-British propaganda, in doing his best to defeat arms limitation, in entertaining naval officers and American newspaper correspondents, in stimulating "the marine industry, both for the navy and the merchant marine" (to use his own words, *Sen. Doc.*, p. 450), in sending out literature designed to discredit American advocates of peace and in inserting his "publicity" in reputable American newspapers, such as The New York Times, under the guise of news (*ibid.*, p. 542).

2. For the purpose of influencing federal legislation by maintaining a lobby in Washington in support of cruiser and merchant-marine bills pending in Congress.

3. For the preparation of political articles to be published in newspapers and magazines.

4. For lectures before patriotic societies and other civic organizations.

5. For the employment of "experts" and other workers, whose exact activities are unknown.

6. For addresses before the American Legion, chambers of commerce and similar organizations (*ibid.*, p. 635).

So much for types of activities. Now what patterns of ideas and selected facts were employed in creating public opinion favorable to the merchant marine and a big navy? There were, of course, the customary materials used by the advocates of navies in all countries: statistics on foreign commerce, assumed requirements of defending such commerce, naval bases, sea routes and comparative naval strength.

The first stroke of genius in the field of ideas, however, was the adoption of a covering ideology under which to group opponents of congressional appropriations for the merchant marine and critics of increased expenditures for the navy. Here the most formidable word was "treason." Since this is a legally defined word and not to be used loosely, Mr. Shearer operated by insinuation. His pamphlet bearing the ominous title, "The Cloak of Benedict Arnold," indicated the category to which he assigned at least certain of the opponents without

LICENSED TO GALE
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

using the actual word. It was printed and circulated with the intention of discrediting the opposition and creating an "atmosphere" favorable to the merchant-marine and navy program espoused by Mr. Shearer and his supporters.

Akin to treason, in the usages of propaganda, are communism and communist internationalism. Of various ideologies associated with these types of theory, Mr. Shearer made full use in his literature and activities. In one of his pieces of propaganda literature entitled "Imperialistic for Peace," he lumped the opponents of naval expansion in one communistic category:

> From October, 1914, the weight of internationalism and communism was developed, the members of which, pacifists, defeatists, radicals of many hues and foreign agents, communists, I. W. W.'s and socialists, included in the merger, and a dozen or more organizations with impressive names designed to fool patriotic Americans and to lend aid to the enemy. Associated with these agents and organizations of these anti-American bodies were statesmen, Senators, bankers, lawyers, actors, directors and writers, men and women of American birth who were used to fight the existing government of the United States. . . .

In this piece of literature, written by Mr. Shearer while he was in the employ of shipbuilding corporations, opposition to navy expansion (and its affiliate, merchant-marine expansion) was associated with communism, conspiracy and revolution, and proof of the fact was alleged to be in the hands of federal authorities. No syllogism could be more precise.

Naturally, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler and other eminent citizens associated with reputable peace societies, distinguished advocates of the League of Nations, and supporters of the World Court could not all be marked with the Red brand. Mr. Shearer declared that "our country was betrayed by Charles Evans Hughes" at the Washington Conference (*Sen. Doc.*, p. 431), assailed Secretary Kellogg, and criticized the position of Secretary Stimson; but he did not contend that everyone in the opposition to his program was a communist or traitor. He admitted that some opponents were merely deluded or uninformed.

Now what kind of person is likely to engage extensively in naval and merchant-marine propaganda? By the nature of things it must be a detached or semi-detached person, fluent in tongue, ready with the pen, and adept in handling politicians and newspaper men. It must be a man or woman accustomed to casual employment, a master of many trades, capable of facile adaptation to the necessities of opportunity. Devotion to a specific career or calling and settled habits of life are a handicap, rather than a help, to anyone engaged in miscellaneous lecturing, writing, lobbying and clandestine negotiations. Suppleness is the prime qualification, in addition to intelligence, physical vigor, dinners, entertainments and supper parties necessary to successful operation.

Mr. Shearer, who may be taken as a type, and a successful type, illustrated in his personality all these practical qualities. Besides possessing the merits of great patriotism (on his own admission) and of descent from American stock of distinction, he had led an interesting and varied life previous to his employment as a lobbyist for a big navy and merchant marine. Dismissing as unproved the charges that he had been guilty of theft and other offenses and was wanted by Scotland Yard for certain lapses in England running from thievery to espionage, we may take his own sworn testimony as sufficient to establish his versatility. "Somewhere around 1920 or 1921," Mr. Shearer was "taken," as he called it, along with a number of other persons, by the police from a dock at or near New Rochelle for buying liquor from a bootlegger, brought before proper authorities, and compelled to put up bail in the sum of five hundred dollars, which he forfeited rather than stand trial (*Sen. Doc.*, pp. 457 ff.). Somewhat earlier, Mr. Shearer had been an "all-around" man in the Old World. In 1912 he met Kid McCoy in Belgium and tried to lease the Wellington Hippodrome to stage a prize fight for him. In London, Mr. Shearer "promoted a night club," ran a theatre and "other things." Displaying his versatility, he engaged in sports, or at all events bet on horse-races. In this connection he got into difficulties over the distribution of winnings.

The student of social psychology, interested in the mental stereotypes and behavioristic patterns of gentlemen engaged in merchant and warship construction will naturally inquire into their intellectual operations with respect to the selection of agents to serve their purposes. This is certainly important in obtaining a clear picture of the social milieu in which marine and naval policies are determined. In this connection it is significant that none of the eminent business leaders who employed Mr. Shearer as a lecturer, writer, propagandist, lobbyist and/or observer seems to have made any inquiry into his antecedents, previous occupations and moral character.

That certain great corporations financed naval and merchant-marine propaganda in their own interest is established as a fact beyond debate. Now what was their managerial set-up to control such activities? Did the responsible heads of these corporations assume direction of the enterprises? The answer must be: not in every case.

Mr. Bardo was president of the New York Shipbuilding Company and Mr. Wilder was once president of the American Brown Boveri Electrical Company, of which the New York Shipbuilding Company was a subsidiary, and thus they could speak with high authority. Mr. Ferguson, president of the Newport News Shipbuilding and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordinate, Mr. Palen, a vice-president, that negotiations were being made with Mr. Shearer for propaganda and/or observational work, and after the enterprise had been under way for some time he learned that an agreement had actually been made with the propagandist and/or observer (*Sen. Doc.*, pp. 174 ff.).

But according to Mr. Ferguson's sworn testimony, he had only vague ideas as to the nature of the propaganda or the activities that were being paid for, and asked his company to approve an appropriation for the undertaking on the most general principles (*ibid.*, p. 211). He did not inquire into the details of the expenditures and was content with the assurance that it had been spent "legitimately." In other words, in the case of the Newport News concern we do not see the board of directors formulating a careful policy, formally adopting it and assuming responsibilities for the results. On the contrary, a subordinate officer takes the initiative, commits the company, informs the president afterward and finally obtains a confirmation with reference to certain items after the propaganda and/or observing had been going on for some time.

Even less proper, from a managerial point of view, was the commitment of the Bethlehem Steel Company. Mr. Charles M. Schwab, chairman of the board of directors, swore that he had never heard of the arrangement made by his corporation until "this question came out." He declared that his interest in the Geneva Arms Conference, at which Mr. Shearer worked for the shipbuilding concerns, grew out of a love of peace. Mr. Shearer thought that his activities in defeating naval reductions meant millions to the construction concerns, but Mr. Schwab confessed to no such view. "I was interested," he said, "in a way that I wanted to see peace come to the world, and especially to this own great country of ours; no entanglements of war. Not only was I interested as a patriotic American citizen, but I may say that I was selfishly interested from a prosperity point of view of this great country, particularly as an industrial country under peaceful conditions."

Here then was the situation: Mr. Schwab, chairman of a great steel corporation, on his own confession ardently believed in peace and was willing to see his ordinance works, "the greatest in the world," "scrapped and sunk to the bottom of the sea," and yet was totally unaware that his company had joined in hiring a man who boasted that he was largely responsible for breaking up the Geneva Arms Conference and thus bringing business to the Bethlehem Steel Company. Mr. Schwab thought the employment of Mr. Shearer, when he publicly found out about it, had been "unwise," but he saw nothing wrong in the organization of management in his concern which permitted a subordinate to make such commitments without informing the president or chairman of the board of directors (*ibid.*, p. 93). In other words, we do not see the heads of this great corporation formulating a policy after due deliberation and engaging a competent authority to represent them in publicity and legislative matters; we see such an important function exercised independently by a subordinate, without the knowledge of his superiors and contrary to their conceptions of "wisdom."

CHARLES A. BEARD.

In the next article in his series, to appear next week, Dr. Beard discusses the Navy League in further detail.—THE EDITORS.

Washington Notes

The Finance Corporation—Out of the Slump by August—Al the Reticent—Gossip at Dinner Roosevelt Rides the Tiger

IT IS A pleasure to report that the undercurrent of alarm about which I wrote last week has apparently turned in the other direction, for at the moment there is more confidence about the future here in Washington than has existed for a long time. This is due largely to the progress of the Emergency Reconstruction Finance Corporation measure, which, in the strong hands of Mr. Eugene Meyer, is counted upon to restore stability to the whole banking structure. Certainly, if this measure does not restore it, nothing will. It puts us financially on a war basis, and the power lodged in the Board, of which Mr. Meyer is the head, is really unprecedented. There has been nothing quite like it, and even in the face of a crisis, it amazes me that it should be going through Congress with so little modification and amendment.

There were two reasons—first, the apprehensive state of mind about the national situation and the general recognition of the need of some great radical step to restore confidence; second, the desire of Democrats and progressives not to stand in the way of any really constructive proposal merely because it came from Mr. Hoover. This desire was particularly deep among the Democrats, who are just as fearful about creating distrust of Democratic leadership among the "business interests" as they are about blocking economic recovery. At any rate the bill is moving along, and as it was the chief feature of the Hoover program, the gratification in White House circles is quite pronounced. The truth is that the political hopes of the administration pretty well center around this bill. In these days politics is so completely entwined with and dependent upon economic conditions that any economic proposal or move has its political phase.

It is no secret that the Hoover administration hopes and believes that its program of economic measures, chief of which is the Reconstruction Finance Board, will pull the country out of its slump by August, thus changing the color of the whole political horizon for Mr. Hoover. This belief is voiced by every man close to the President with whom I have talked in the past week. Their conviction is that if the election next November can be held not in the midst of a deep depression but rather in the shadow of a retreating one, the Republican ticket will surely be elected. Friends

BORROWED TUNNELS ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the President have been digging back into the past for political precedents in depression years and find their greatest comfort in 1896. In that year, they found, Bryan gained his nomination in June when the depression was pronounced, and he gained it through a sensationally eloquent and persuasive assertion that he could cure the depression by the unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one as compared to gold. In June, when he was nominated, he had a great chance to be elected and, if the depression had continued, he undoubtedly would have been. But in August—two months after his nomination—the depression began to lift, the first visible sign being a rise in the price of wheat. The hope is that this depression will lift about the same time and for the same obscure but invincible economic reasons. Then, according to precedent, the Republicans will continue in power because of the natural disinclination of the people to change when things are becoming better.

In the meantime the Democratic struggle for the nomination proceeds apace. Roosevelt's candidacy is out in the open and his managers are driving things as hard as they can in order to discourage competition and render the band-wagon argument more potent. Since the Democratic Committee meeting, the developments have been insignificant and the most experienced observers still consider it an open fight. The next few weeks, I think, will tell the story. Before the middle of February, Al Smith, the one big obstacle to Roosevelt's nomination, will either have to move decisively, thereby really making it an open fight, or concede Roosevelt's nomination.

Pressure is now being brought to bear upon Smith to do something. A movement is under way to enter him as a candidate in the North Dakota, New Hampshire and Wisconsin primaries. He has strong Democratic friends in all three—particularly the latter two. In addition, his Pennsylvania friends insist he is the only man who can prevent Roosevelt from gaining control of its big delegation. The plan now is to file Smith's name in these states, and put it up to him to act. He will then either have to consent or refuse. If he consents, it means that the fight against Roosevelt will center around him, but in any event there seems little chance of keeping the Governor out of the nomination.

I have no real information as to what Smith will do. Nor, so far as I can ascertain, has anyone else. I do know that he is aware of the intention to file his name in several states, and I do know that he has the power to prevent it from being done. Further, I know that if he does prevent it or if, after the filing has been done with his knowledge, he then repudiates his supporters and refuses to fight, a good many of his personal and political friends here in the East are not only going to be disappointed, but sore as well. This mystery stuff does not even now sit well with a lot of them. They have largely taken their hostility to Roosevelt from the Smith-Raskob attitude, and are definitely classed as hostile by the Roosevelt management. Roosevelt is the type of man who would distinguish between his original friends and those falling into line when they could do nothing else.

I somewhat sympathize with the position of Smith's supporters. As enemies of Roosevelt they seem to have a right to expect Smith at least to put up a fight. I think he will, but if he does not, he will certainly lose some of these adoring admirers who now cluster about him, confer and lunch with him in the Empire State Building. In brief, Mr. Smith has got to fight or take a back seat. His speech at the Jackson Day dinner did not particularly enhance his prestige. It lacked something of the old fire and fearlessness, and it missed being a real hit largely, I believe, because of this very uncertainty about his intentions. The primary test will remove that uncertainty. We shall know one way or another before long.

There were two features of that Jackson Day dinner which received scant attention. One was the confidential whisper spread around the lobby of the Mayflower by anti-Roosevelt leaders concerning some mysterious development that would eliminate Roosevelt as a candidate—some secret information explaining Smith's inaction. It was not, it was whispered, necessary to do anything to head Roosevelt off. The situation would take care of itself.

Efforts to extract more than this vague prophecy were entirely ineffectual. Personally, I do not believe such reasons exist. There could be but two things—Roosevelt's health, or some scandal. The last can, of course, be dismissed. There is no touch of scandal connected with Roosevelt's name and there is not likely to be any. As for his health, the most reliable authorities scout the idea that it is not better now than at any time since his attack nearly ten years ago. Though the suggestion of anything "coming out" that would automatically eliminate Roosevelt is ridiculously unfounded, the rumor was spread at the time of the dinner—and is still being spread.

The other political-dinner development was the clearing up of Tammany's attitude toward Roosevelt. It was conceded by both his New York friends and foes that Tammany would support him. Further, it was conceded that Tammany would support him despite the fact that he probably will be forced to remove one or more Tammany officials on whom the relentless Seabury got the goods. Tammany, it is said, will realize there is nothing else the Governor can do and that to declare war on him for doing it would put Tammany in a defenseless position. Also, in my judgment, it would do more to nominate him than Tammany support.

Be that as it may, it is generally agreed that Tammany is going along with Roosevelt, which means that Roosevelt will have the whole state delegation behind him unless Smith chooses to contest his nomination. If he does, Al's friends claim there are several upstate districts which he could capture. No claim is made that Tammany would incline toward Al as a candidate, nor that, without Tammany, Al could do anything in New York City.

Summing up this Democratic situation, all I can say is that the Roosevelt stoppers have not yet got Roosevelt stopped. I believe he can be stopped, because the really impressive and influential party leaders would prefer almost any other available candidate. It is clearly Al's move and everybody is waiting for him to make it. Likewise, I should like to go on record as believing that if Al becomes a candidate in the primaries, as his friends now predict, he will not be the party nominee himself, if and when Roosevelt is blocked. The most likely compromise is Baker.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It surely ought to be clear that if Smith can stop Roosevelt, Roosevelt can stop Smith. It seems rather a pity that the Democrats, with such extraordinarily bright prospects, should be so intensely engaged in this stopping game. But there you are. Democrats seem addicted to it.

Washington. T. R. B.

Mycenae and Connecticut

Sophocles' Electra, translated by J. T. Sheppard. Selwyn Theatre, January 8, 1932.

The Animal Kingdom, by Philip Barry. Broadhurst Theatre, January 12, 1932.

ONLY THE greatest talent, working on the material of a Greek drama, can do anything very important with it, recreating it into something it never was but which yet is more interesting than attempts—all too vain—at accuracy alone. It is, therefore, idle to pick faults with almost any presentation of these plays, since at least we can hear the words and follow the superb progression of the structure. The first of the special matinees of "Electra" in which Mrs. Patrick Campbell and Miss Blanche Yurka took the leading parts, was in some respects as fair as many other Greek revivals and in other respects as lacking. Remembering that the Greek theatre was a male enterprise and that the whole ritual of dramatic production came from an elaborate and ancient organization and point of view, we may find the young ladies rushing about and speaking fragments of great passages as magnificent and corporate as the Roman high mass, insufferable, and may in passing curse the phenomenon of the so-called expressive dancing which lets them loose like that, a mere display of arms and futile egotisms. But I for one am disposed to let it all pass, and to be grateful for the incident that lets me see the play again in any form. The point of this comment is only a single point with regard to Greek revivals in our English-speaking theatres.

It is obvious that classic art in its full flower and form is a permanent quality of the human mind, which is to say of art. A good deal of this quality is so basic and universal that it passes easily into all countries and into the comprehension of many variously different kinds of artists. It is equally obvious, or it is so to me at least, that when we come to the drama end of Greek art, the Teutonic races will never really understand it. The problem of producing a Greek play is insoluble; we can take many directions, and to make it as realistic as Miss Yurka did, is one. We would expect, then, the scenes of violent expression, speeches where a quarrel was on or something crucial was about to be done, to go best, and this was true for both Miss Yurka and Mrs. Campbell. Where everybody in the cast of Sophocles' play broke down was in the long speeches. This is not only because translations of the Greek are, quite naturally, by lesser authors than the Attic dramatists themselves, and not only because even if the verse were great verse, almost none of our actors would know how to read it. It is not only the problem of the high formalism, to which our theatre is unaccustomed. Nor is it only because the dramatist's choruses are, for the technical and material resources of most productions, nothing but lyrical or sententious obstacles in the progress of the play. What makes such revivals of Greek pieces seem all spots, with moribund gaps between, turns finally on a question of energy.

A good Anglo-Saxon, rushing off to walk, to ride, to swing a tennis racket or golf club, to fighting battles or pounding typewriters, will find the South Italian short of action; despite that energy of bed and brain and that enormous vitality, this unrushing citizen will seem but laziness and *dolce far niente*. The leg of a bad Rodin, full of slime and knots for muscles, will seem all energy to this Nordic manhood's eye, the inexhaustible energy of a fine Greek sculpture, so felt by subtle fingers passing over the surface, will not even be guessed. On exactly the same basis, that first long long speech of Electra's meant nothing at all when Miss Yurka did it. And Mrs. Campbell, though her Clytemnestra made a superb entrance, thrilling to the spine, gave out when she came to the deceiving surface of that speech in which Clytemnestra, her mind haunted by dreams and forebodings, tries to persuade the god to shield her fortunes. Such passages as these for Electra and Clytemnestra require for the stage moment of them terrific vitality and inexhaustible control in modulation and emotional pressure. Under those remote and lofty words that Clytemnestra speaks there is all that hidden wind and storm of horror, fear, hate, superstition, pride and passion. Electra's speech must be studied and rendered like a musical composition, as complex and exigent as that. We may take, for one example, the names she mentions—Philomela, Niobe, Persephone and the rest. These are not mere similes, apostrophes and declamatory ornaments; they are great figures from the past of Electra's race, images to her mind of human character and destiny; the mere names of them are vast shapes of abstract thought, and when she mentions them she sees herself in their company, their presences throw light on her case, and through her they are suddenly in life again. The easiest parts of such a Greek play are the passages of action and sharp struggle and death; but even they have no full and right culmination, and cannot find their due plane, without the conveyance of those other passages, more in the Attic style, less easily universal, by which we move toward them and from them.

Mr. Philip Barry's new play follows more or less the general lines of "Paris Bound" and some of his other pieces. It concerns, as they did, the fortunes of young married couples who are finding their adjustments to life, love and each other. In "The Animal Kingdom" we have for the central figure a rich young man, Tom Collier, who has known the artists, helped them not only with money but with a far more important gift of wisdom toward them and toward their progress and creation. He has had a great friendship, and a sort of side issue of a love affair, with Daisy Sage, who is now abroad studying painting, at which she has been for a year. Tom Collier falls in love with and marries Cecilia, a young lady in the world of respectable society. Tom has a publishing business, which now, along with most of the rest of him, suffers from the lack of inspiration that his new life and new friends afford him. His old friends feel the difference in him, and in the third act accept an invitation to his Connecticut home in order to investigate for themselves why, though he remains the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same dear fellow and their love for him the same, or perhaps their love for his old self, they find him sinking from what he innately is. The attraction of his wife for him is a strong one, largely physical, and she it is who persuades him further and further from his own direction. In the end he leaves her and goes back to Daisy, who since her return from abroad has deserted the free air of friendship that their relation had formerly been and will have him wholly or not at all.

In this play Mr. Barry has made, I think, a real advance in his portrayal of stronger feelings and is even more secure in his talent for conveying definite and profound themes under the easy journalism of daily chatter and without heavy lining and bourgeois seriousness. And he is more secure in his talent for establishing the motivations and progress of his play by his manipulation of atmosphere and personality rather than lumped masses and signposts in dramaturgy. These very gifts, however, put him all the more at the mercy of the actors; his writing is never actor-proof. In the new play he is lucky in having Mr. Leslie Howard in the leading part, who plays with the most perfect exactness and proportion all through and who hits, it would seem, precisely the right relation that Tom Collier is to have to his wife on one hand and on the other to the Bohemian artist friends, this done always with taste and a fine sense of emotional levels.

Mr. Barry is lucky too in having Mr. William Gargan do the butler, a fresh and happy creation of the author's. He is a sort of friend and barometer of what goes on around and inside the hero, and provides the material of the happiest scenes in the play, scenes that no other author in our theatre could have done or would have thought of. I cannot say the same for the rest of the company. Miss Ilka Chase, who did the sort of moron social lady, with her Sunday breakfasts, was fair enough. But I never believed for a moment in the lure of the wife, nor that Daisy, the first and last friend of Tom Collier's, was either a free and clear spirit or in any sense an artistic talent of any importance at all. The sense of free, strong, rude life in the artists, when they came to Tom's home to look things over, would have excused and made poignant their conduct there; but, as the actors carried matters at the Broadhurst, the whole business seemed merely insistent and ill bred, the saving artist friend only egotistical, cocksure and unpleasant rather than moving or capable of the humility and compulsion of sincerity and deep life.

I wish that Mr. Barry, now that he has succeeded in doing artists that are convincing as whimsical companions, dear playmates or disrupters of family arrangements, would try an artist who is the sting and impact of the real thing. I can still remember the abashment with which I first came on Jean Christophe and the secret and pain by which all creation comes into the world, in sum, on an artist in a novel. Joe Fisk, Mr. Barry's novelist—with Mr. Harvey Stephens acting as much as possible like that excellent player Mr. Donald MacDonald, who in his turn is now putting as much of a Philip Barry note as possible into Mr. Elmer Rice's inconsequent drama, "The Left Bank"—gets, as do the violinist Franc and Daisy the painter, only so far as the "Vie de Bohéme," though Mr. Barry's writing, compared to Murger's, is less false as regards artists and their world and in a sense far less true.

STARK YOUNG.

A Hoosier Quixote

Hibben, Paxton, journalist; b. Indianapolis, Ind., Dec. 5, 1880, s. Thomas Entrekin and Jeannie Merrill (Ketcham) H.; A.B. Princeton, 1903. A.M. Harvard, 1904.

THINKING men were worried in the Middle West in the years Hibben was growing up there, something was wrong with the American Republic, was it the Gold Standard, Privilege, The Interests, Wall Street?

The rich were getting richer, the poor were getting poorer, small farmers were being squeezed out, working men were working twelve hours a day for a bare living; profits were for the rich, the law was for the rich, the cops were for the rich;

was it for that the pilgrims had bent their heads into the storm, filled the fleeing Indians with slugs out of their blunderbusses

and worked the stony farms in New England?

was it for that the pioneers had crossed the Appalachians

long squirrel guns slung across lean backs,

a fistful of corn in the pockets of their buckskin vests?

was it for that the Indiana farmboys had turned out to shoot down Johnny Reb and make the black man free?

Paxton Hibben was a small cantankerous boy, son of one of the best families (the Hibbens had a wholesale dry-goods business in Indianapolis); in school the rich kids didn't like him because he went around with the poor kids and the poor kids didn't like him because his folks were rich

but he was the star pupil of Short Ridge High

ran the paper

won all the debates.

At Princeton he was the young college editor of The Tiger, drank a lot, didn't deny that he ran around after women (in those days college boys were supposed to be neuter), made a brilliant scholastic record and was a thorn in the flesh of the godly.

The natural course for a bright young man of his class and position was to study law (legal chicanery is one gateway to politics, money and power in the American republic) but Hibben wanted

travel and romance a la Byron and de Musset,

well groomed adventures in foreign lands,

so

as his family was one of the best in Indiana and friendly with Senator Beveridge, he was gotten a post in the diplomatic service.

3rd sec. and 2nd sec. American Em. St. Petersburg, Mexico City, 1906-8; sec. legation and chargé d'affaires, Bogota, Colombia, 1906-9, The Hague and Luxemburg, 1909-12, Santiago, Chile, 1912 (retired).

Pushkin for de Musset

St. Petersburg was a young dude's romance:

gold-encrusted spires under a platinum sky,

the icy-gray Neva flowing swift and deep under bridges that jingled with sleighbells;

riding home from the islands with the Grand Duke's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mistress, the most beautiful, most amorous singer of Neapolitan street songs;

staking a pile of rubles in a tall room glittering with chandeliers, monocles, diamonds dripped on white shoulders,

white snow, white table cloths, white sheets,

Kakhetian wine, vodka fresh as new-mown hay, Astrakhan caviar, sturgeon, Finnish salmon, Lapland ptarmigan, and the most beautiful women in the world;

but it was 1905.

Hibben left the embassy one night

and saw a flare of red against the trampled snow of the Nevsky

and red flags,

blood frozen in the ruts, blood trickling down the car tracks;

he saw the machine guns on the balconies of the Winter Palace, the cossacks charging the unarmed crowds

that wanted peace and food and a little freedom,

heard the throaty roar of the Russian Marseillaise;

some stubborn streak in the old American blood flared in revolt,

he walked the streets all night with the revolutionists,

got in wrong at the embassy

and was transferred to Mexico City

where there was no revolution yet, only peons and priests and the stillness of the great volcanoes.

The *Cientificos* made him a member of the Jockey Club

where in the magnificent building of blue Puebla tile he lost all his money at roulette and helped them drink up the last few cases of champagne left over from the plunder of Cortez.

Chargé d'Affaires in Colombia (he never forgot he owed his career to Beveridge; he believed passionately in Roosevelt, and Righteousness and Reform, and the Anti-trust Laws, the Big Stick that was going to scare away the grafters and malefactors of great wealth and get the common man his due), he helped wangle the revolution that stole the Canal Zone from the Bishop of Bogota; later he stuck up for Roosevelt in the Pulitzer libel suit; he was a progressive, believed in the Canal and T.R.

He was shunted to the Hague, where he went to sleep during the vague deliberations of the International Tribunal.

In 1912 he resigned from the diplomatic service and went home to campaign for Roosevelt,

got to Chicago in time to hear them singing "Onward Christian Soldiers" at the convention in the Coliseum

in the close-packed voices and the cheers, he heard the trample of the Russian Marseillaise, the sullen silence of Mexican peons, Colombian Indians waiting for a deliverer, in the reverberance of the hymn he heard the measured cadences of the Declaration of Independence.

The talk of social justice petered out: T.R. was an empty windbag like the rest of the politicians, the Bull Moose was stuffed with the same sawdust as the G.O.P.

Paxton Hibben ran for Congress as a Progressive in Indiana, but the European War had already taken people's minds off social justice.

U.S. corr. Collier's Weekly, 1914-15; Associated Press in Europe, 1915-17; war corr. Leslie's Weekly in Near East, and sec. Russian Commn. of Near East Relief, June-Dec. 1921.

In those years he forgot all about the diplomat's mauve silk bathrobe and the ivory toilet sets and the little *tête-à-têtes* with grand duchesses,

he went to Germany as Beveridge's secretary, saw the German troops goose-stepping through Brussels,

saw Poincaré visiting the long doomed galleries of Verdun between ranks of bitter half-mutinous soldiers in blue,

saw the gangrened wounds, the cholera, the typhus, the little children with their bellies swollen with famine, the maggoty corpses of the Serbian retreat, drunk Allied officers chasing sick naked girls upstairs in the brothels in Saloniki, soldiers looting stores and churches, French and British sailors fighting with beer bottles in the bars,

walked up and down the terrace with King Constantine during the bombardment of Athens, fought a duel with a French commission agent who left the room when a German sat down to eat in the dining room at the Grande Bretagne; Hibben thought the duel was a joke until all his friends began putting on silk hats; he stood up and let the Frenchman take two shots at him and then fired into the ground; in Athens as everywhere he was always in hot water, a slightly built, truculent man, always standing up for his friends, for people out of luck, for some idea, too reckless ever to lay down the careful stepping-stones of a respectable career.

Commd. 1st lieut. F.A., Nov. 27, 1917; capt., May 31, 1919; served at War Coll., Camp Grant, in France with 332d F.A.; Finance Bureau, S.O.S., at G.H.Q. in office Insp. Gen. A.E.F.; discharged Aug. 21, 1919; capt. O.R.C. Feb. 7, 1920; recommd. Feb. 7, 1925.

The war in Europe was bloody and dirty and dull, but the war in New York revealed such slimy depths of vileness and hypocrisy that no man who saw it can ever feel the same again towards his fellow countrymen.

In the army training camps it was different, the boys believed in a world safe for Democracy; Hibben believed in the Fourteen Points, he believed in the War to End War until the Peace Conference.

With mil. mission to Armenia; Aug.-Dec. 1919; staff corr. in Europe for Chicago Tribune, 1919-1920; with Near East Relief, 1920-22; sec. Russian Red Cross commn. in America, 1922; v.dir. for U. S. Nansen Relief Mission, 1923; sec. Am. Com. Relief Russian Children, Apr. 1922.

In the famine year, the cholera year, the typhus year, Paxton Hibben went to Moscow with a relief commission.

In Paris they were still haggling over the price of blood, squabbling over toy flags, the river frontiers on relief maps, the historical destiny of peoples (which is to be sold out by their rulers), while behind the scenes the good chess players, the Deterdings, the Zaharoffs, the Stinnesses, sat quiet and possessed themselves of the raw materials.

In Moscow there was order.

In Moscow there was work,

In Moscow there was hope;

the "Marseillaise" of 1905, "Onward Christian Soldiers" of 1912, the sullen passiveness of American Indians, of infantrymen waiting for death at the front, were part of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hibben believed in the new world.
Back in America
somebody got hold of a photograph of Captain Paxton Hibben laying a wreath on Jack Reed's grave.
They tried to throw him out of the O.R.C.:
at Princeton, at the twentieth reunion of his college class, his classmates started to lynch him; they were drunk and perhaps it was just a college-boy prank twenty years too late, but they had a noose around his neck,
lynch the goddamn Red,
no more place in America for change, no more place for the old gags; social justice, progressivism, revolt against oppression, democracy; put the Reds on the skids, no money for them, no sympathy for them, no jobs for them.

Mem. Authors' League of America, Soc. Colonial Wars, Vets. Foreign Wars, Am. Legion; fellow Royal and Am. Geog. Socs. Decorated Chevalier Order of St. Stanislas (Russian); Officer Order of the Redeemer (Greek), Order of the Sacred Treasure (Japan). Clubs: Princeton, Newspaper, Civic (New York) Author: Constantine I and the Greek People, 1920; The Famine in Russia, 1922. Henry Ward Beecher—an American Portrait, 1927.

It was that bitterness of disappointment in T.R., in Progressivism, in Democracy, in his classmates at Princeton, in America, that made him write so consummately well the history of that great American windbag, phrasemaker, lecturer, Henry Ward Beecher
who carried lying in righteousness
to the pitch of sublimity.
Hibben was a man who had believed in many things
in America and Russia and the new world
he didn't want the new imperial ritz-mad America
of the House of Morgan
neither did he want to die of pneumonia at the age of forty-eight.

JOHN DOS PASSOS.

A COMMUNICATION

Long Range Planning and the Marxian Indictment

SIR: The report on Long Range Planning published by The New Republic in its issue of January 13, while containing many features that are individually praiseworthy, seems to me to be both weak and ambiguous in its fundamental outlook. Presented as a less radical alternative than collective ownership of industry, the plan fails to make clear whether the comparative mildness of the measures proposed is due to a different diagnosis of the disease from that of the collectivists or to a difference in method of cure on the basis of the same diagnosis.

To judge from such features as the voluntary association of the various economic interests, the emphasis on factual surveys and publicity and the general appeal to private industry to set its own house in order, one would suppose that there is no basic conflict of interests and that the evils of the present regime arise purely from the failure to utilize knowledge—either the knowledge that is now available or the knowledge that could be made available under proper

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the authors of the report include among their main objectives the increase in the purchasing power of labor and the limitation and control of expenditure on capital plant. These objectives correspond to the two points in the Marxian indictment of the anarchy of production under competitive capitalism: to wit, that the workers cannot buy back enough of the goods, whereas the capitalistic *entrepreneurs* who have the money to buy back the goods are impelled to turn back their profits into production plant with the hope of pyramiding their gains. If the writers of the plan accept the Marxian diagnosis of overproduction, then it is obvious that the measures they have proposed and the spirit in which they are asking business men to enter the planning organization are not calculated to make any appreciable headway against present evils. It is not that the measures are too mild, in the sense that they dispense with blood and thunder: it is simply that they are inappropriate. If the problem is one in which all men are agreed about the end and it is only factual ignorance that is holding us back (as, for example, in public health), then it is a case for calling in the fact-finding scientist and taking his advice. But if the problem is one that arises from a conflict of interests, as, for example, international war, or the chaos of economic production according to the Marxian view, then fact-finding science is a snare and a delusion, for it tries to solve the problem of the conflict of interests by assuring us that the interests of all are identical.

Whether or not the authors of the report accept the view that the conflict of individual interests is the principal cause of overproduction and unemployment, no other thesis is actually tenable; for not only has the Marxian analysis never been refuted, but it stands to reason that if the cause were less deep-rooted than the wills of men, the remedy would long ago have been found. If this, then, is the situation, we need, not science, but social statesmanship, a statesmanship which appeals to the unifying power of reason among men and which creates, on the basis of the disinterested sentiments which we all share at some moments, a physical mechanism designed to guide and restrain our ordinary interested appetites. It is obvious that such a mechanism must be incorporated into the State, which is after all nothing but the developing system of the coercive guidance of individuals by society and for society.

In the face of the solemn task of creating an organization for the social direction of economic production, it seems to me both futile and mischievous to hide the sacrifices that have to be demanded from the present holders of economic privileges, or to attempt to create a distinction between collective planning and collective ownership. When the planners talk of limiting expenditure on capital plant and increasing the purchasing power of labor, are they not in effect socializing and confiscating the basic privilege of private property? I refer not to the privilege of drawing interest on savings, but to that privilege, which every possessor of capital has, of competing for a share of what Marx calls the surplus value of labor; the privilege, in other words, of speculating for profits and thereby bringing on not merely the basic injustice in the distribution of income but also the periodic disequilibration of economic life as a whole. (The planners are attempting to draw a distinction between profits based on excess of demand over

disproportionate changes in values of raw materials, products, wages and interest, which are to be barred. But the answer to the distinction is that if they create a mechanism to stabilize proportionate values, the rate of profit will necessarily be frozen into a fixed interest charge; and if profit is to be speculative, then it will disequilibrate the price values of labor, commodities, etc.)

It is the thing and not the word that counts. If the thing is to abolish the speculative-profit possibilities of private capital, then it does not matter whether we call the system collective planning or collective ownership (with the indemnification of shareholders). Whatever word we give it (and for my part it may be called *abracadabra* or *system X*) it will require a surrender of privileges. It will require also that the surrender be made in a rational social manner rather than in the arbitrary and haphazard manner of charity drives.

On both of these points the report is weak, and the weakness in both cases springs from the fundamental inability to grasp the nature of the problem involved. Because the writers of the report fail to realize that it is a political question of surrendering privileges, they are encouraging the business interests to believe that they can eat their cake and have it at the same time, that they can pursue their own interest and be also socially minded. And for the same reason, the organization they have set up is so largely consultative rather than directive.

I share with the writers of the report the concern for a peaceful solution of the social problem and the fear of revolutions to come. And I also believe with them that the best way of running industry is by utilizing the knowledge and experience of the present directors. But unless our captains of industry are ready for a "Fourth of September," unless they are ready to make the necessary renunciation of their private privileges and pledge their services to the nation, there is nothing to do but wait and prepare on the side of labor for the readjustment of social forces.

In the French Revolution the "Fourth of September" came too late to stem the cataclysm of blood which drenched Europe for twenty-five years. Will our "Fourth of September" also come too late? The answer lies with the captains of industry.

Long Island City, N. Y. BENJAMIN GINZBURG.

[A long reply might be written to Mr. Ginzburg, but for the present I should like to make a few simple points. Mr. Ginzburg prejudges the question whether, given a nationally defined objective, sufficient information and means of organization, capitalist interests would block the desired action. He may be right. The report suggests an experiment to discover whether he is. If he is, what it suggests would lay the basis for a more coercive machinery. I cannot speak for the committee on the question of profits, but my own opinion is that social planning, by its very nature, must eliminate speculative profit in so far as it succeeds. Mr. Ginzburg is in error, by the way, in saying that the committee draws any distinction between "legitimate" profits and profits which are to be "barred." The language may be too technical for ready comprehension, but the passage which he cites means merely that, in our existing economy, when profits arise from an excess of demand over supply, they give an indication that the output in question ought to be expanded, but when profits arise from disturbance of various classes of prices, they do not give that indication.—GEORGE SOULE.]

CORRESPONDENCE

A Mooney Meeting in Washington

SIR: Effectively to focus public attention to the nationwide demand for Tom Mooney's pardon, an afternoon conference has been called at Washington, D. C., Sunday, January 24, at 2:30 P. M., at the Hotel Hamilton, Fourteenth and K. Streets, to which Tom Mooney's friends from various cities throughout the United States are being invited.

This conference will be followed by a public meeting at 8 P. M. at the Friends' Meeting House, 2111 Florida Avenue. The speakers will be:

Senator Edward P. Costigan of Colorado; Senator Bronson N. Cutting of New Mexico; Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana; Mr. Edward Nockels, secretary, Chicago Federation of Labor; Father John A. Ryan, director, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Rabbi Edward L. Israel, chairman, Central Conference of American Rabbis, and Worth M. Tippy, executive secretary, the Social Service Commission, Federal Council of Churches. Edward Keating, editor of Labor, will be chairman.

The publication of the long suppressed Wickersham Report is a powerful blow to the California die-hards. For the first time in the long fight, Tom's jailers are completely on the defensive. The Washington conference and public meeting will be held on the fifteenth anniversary of Tom's trial.

New Republic readers have helped in the effort to vindicate Tom Mooney; therefore we strongly urge that they attend the Washington meetings.

ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ,
Chairman, Tom Mooney
Pardon Conference of New York.

New York City.

A Question of Title

SIR: On page 231 of your issue of January 13, 1932, under the title of "The Deportation Terror," you published the article which I sent to you under the title of "Our Deportation System." No notice was given to me that my title was to be changed. For several reasons, I should not have consented to the caption which was used.

Baltimore, Md. REUBEN OPPENHEIMER.

[In spite of Mr. Oppenheimer's modesty and his leaning toward understatement, we believe that the facts as exposed in the article justify the title as printed. Of course we are glad to assume sole responsibility for it.—THE EDITORS.]

The Easton Bombs

SIR: "There can be little doubt that the bombs mailed last week to various diplomatic representatives of the Italian government in the United States and to prominent Italo-Americans were sent by anti-Fascists," writes The New Republic in its issue of January 13.

The New York Evening Post published a dispatch from its Paris correspondent stating that in the opinion of high officials of the French Police Department [the affair] bore the earmark of Fascist activities, so well known to French police.

We are, here, in the realm of opinion.

The facts in the case are these: an explosion took place at Easton, Pennsylvania; packages containing explosives were mailed to different parts of the country addressed to prominent Italian and Fascist officials.

I do not care what the individual opinions are in the matter. I agree with The New Republic that this act is a "dreadful crime." However, I must say that under the circumstances, without any knowledge of the real facts, before a substantial proof has been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adduced in support of the expressed opinion, it is just as much "a dreadful crime" for The New Republic not only to express an opinion in the matter, but also to lay the blame at the door of the anti-Fascist movement.

In the Mooney-Billings case we find the same way of paving the road to a miscarriage of justice. There was no doubt, in the mind of the framers of the dread verdict, that the bomb set off in Market Square in the preparedness parade was placed by Mooney and Billings. But the prosecuting officers in San Francisco had in their minds a specific purpose to get Mooney, right or wrong.

What The New Republic has in mind when, unsolicited and apparently without any particular interest, [it] places the blame for the Easton crime on the anti-Fascists, I do not know. . . .

But let me remind you, here, that even Lieutenant Newman, head of the bomb squad—from whom the anti-Fascists should not expect kind consideration—has, so far, refused to state definitely that in his opinion the dreadful crime was committeed by anti-Fascists. . . .

New York City. CARLO TRESCA.

SIR: We are surprised and shocked to read the editorial paragraph which begins with the flat statement, "There can be little doubt that the bombs mailed last week to various diplomatic representatives of the Italian government in the United States and to prominent Italo-Americans were sent by anti-Fascists."

Is not this a flagrant case of finding people guilty not only in advance of a trial but even in advance of any evidence tending to cast suspicion upon them?

You state that this outrage is unfortunate because it will serve to wipe out in the public mind whatever difference may have existed between "terroristic anarchists" and other types of anti-Fascists, but will not your own editorial have the same effect?

Not a single bit of evidence to support the charge that anti-Fascists perpetrated this act has so far been uncovered, whereas it is well known, on the other hand, that Fascists, when it has suited their purpose, have not hesitated to use every sort of terrorism and provocation in the attempt to discredit their opponents. Not to mention thousands of instances occurring in Italy itself, there are many well known instances in France and elsewhere.

In 1928, the Fascist agents Sacchi and Ganovi attempted to stage a bomb plot in Nice, France, ostensibly against their own chiefs, but to involve anti-Fascists with the French government. They were frustrated by the vigilance of the French authorities.

In the same year four bombs exploded in the Italian Consulate at Tunis. It was afterward discovered that the consul himself, Barduzzi, was responsible for the plot, and he was cashiered for his clumsiness by the Italian government. Needless to say, the bombs exploded when no one was present, and there were no fatalities.

In 1925, in Jean les Pins, France, two bombs sent to Fascist officials exploded without, however, injuring anyone. In an investigation, which was conducted by the French police, it was found that the bombs had been manufactured by two Fascists, who were promptly expelled from France.

A striking instance of Fascist intriguing is to be found in the case of the internationally famous Fascist *provocateur,* Menapace, who caused the arrest in France of such anti-Fascists of moderate leanings as Alberto Cianca, editor of the suppressed liberal (Nitti) paper, Il Mondo, Alberto Tarchiani, ex-editor-in-chief of the largest conservative paper in Italy, Corriere della Sera, and Giuseppe Sardelli, an ex-deputy of the Italian Parliament, and Professor Berneri.

Menapace, himself, placed the bombs in the hands of these moderate anti-Fascists, then had the French police raid their homes. At the trial which followed, the fact was disclosed that Menapace was an *agent provocateur.*

On October 28, 1931, a bomb exploded in the Italian consulate in Chambéry, France. Although the claim was made that the bomb had been thrown through a window, it was found that the window had been locked and because of the general condition surrounding this explosion, French opinion had it that the plot was of Fascist origin.

In connection with the recent visit of Dino Grandi to the United States, anti-Fascists carried on a very effective campaign; keeping public attention fixed on the real nature of Fascism and the underlying purpose of Grandi's visit, namely, to facilitate the getting of loans from American bankers to sustain the Fascist regime in Italy and to popularize the whole idea of Fascism in the United States. Unquestionably, Mussolini is desperately anxious to undo this work by creating the impression that anti-Fascists are terrorists and bomb-throwers. Certainly the world needs no further evidence to support the statement that he would not hesitate for a moment to sacrifice a few lives in order to gain such an end.

In this connection, is it not of the utmost significance that not a single Fascist was actually hurt or even came near to being injured?

There is definite suspicion in well informed circles that the outrage may be linked up with the municipal corruption in New York City which is being exposed by the Seabury investigation. Generoso Pope, on whom most of the newspaper attention has been concentrated, is the president of the Colonial Sand and Gravel Company, which has grown rich under the favoritism of Tammany Hall. Pope is very close to Mayor Walker. It is understood that his business and political activities are under investigation. Obviously it might be of some assistance to Mr. Pope and the Mayor if the former could pose as a martyr of bomb plots.

It is not even impossible, we submit, that sinister influences connected with our own government may have instigated these provocative acts in order to justify a policy of deporting "dangerous foreigners" and suppressing radical activities generally, at a time when the Doak deportation activities have raised a storm of protest and when economic conditions are stirring up revolt among the workers. No one who has the slightest familiarity with conditions in Kentucky and other coal fields, for example, or who recalls the acts of terror and provocation during the Palmer raids at the close of the War, will doubt that there is at least a possibility that higher-ups may wish to divert the attention of the public from unemployment and hunger marches and to create an atmosphere in which it may be possible for them to launch a ruthless terrorism against labor organizers and plain workers who may have the audacity to protest or to attempt to organize unions for their own protection.

We hold that it is the plain and solemn duty of all liberal organs, in view of the record, to hold Fascism guilty until it has proven itself innocent and anti-Fascists innocent until and unless the contrary has been conclusively proven.

Our committee welcomes the most thorough investigation of the distressing occurrence in Easton as well as of its own activities.

A. J. MUSTE,
Chairman, the Committee for
New York City. International Anti-Fascist Protest.

[There are only two sensible hypotheses regarding the bombs mailed to various prominent Italo-Americans and officials of the Italian government in the United States. Either they were the work of Fascists seeking to discredit their enemies, or they were mailed by the enemies themselves. The New Republic does not know which explanation is correct, and is glad to give space to the views of Messrs. Tresca and Muste on the subject. At the same time, we still hold the opinion expressed in the editorial, which was that "there can be little doubt" that the mailing of the bombs was not the work of *agents provocateurs.* These were real bombs; two of them killed three men and wounded four other people, and it is fair to assume that the others would have killed the persons who opened the packages, if these had not been forewarned of their contents. It was only by accident that the bombs did not reach those to whom they were addressed. To suppose that the Fascists would try to murder half a dozen of their leading representatives in America in order to discredit the anti-Fascists here seems to us to strain the limits of common sense. We are well aware that by far the most important elements in the anti-Fascist movement throughout the world are men who would never condone the use of terroristic methods, and have no contact with the terrorists; and our editorial was intended to distinguish between the two groups. We cannot believe that to point out that fact is a disservice to the cause of those who oppose the Mussolini regime.—THE EDITORS]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Last of Lyric Poets

VV (Viva), by E. E. Cummings. New York: Horace Liveright. 70 pages. $2.50.

E. E. CUMMINGS, the son of a Cambridge minister, attended Harvard University during a period which has never been properly described, that of the Harvard esthetes. It followed the period of Jack Reed and Walter Lippmann, when socialism had a brief vogue at Harvard and H. G. Wells was perhaps the most popular author. The esthetes, for their part, had no interest whatever in social problems. They read Casanova's memoirs and "Les Liaisons Dangereuses," both in the original French, and Petronius in Latin; they gathered at teatime in one another's rooms, or at punches in the offices of The Harvard Monthly; they drank seidels of dry gin topped with a maraschino cherry; they discussed the music of Pater, the rhythms of Aubrey Beardsley and, growing louder, the voluptuousness of the Church, the essential virtue of prostitution. They had crucifixes in their bedrooms, and ticket-stubs from last Saturday's burlesque at the Old Howard. They were trying to create, in Cambridge, Mass., an after-image of Oxford in the eighteen-nineties. They wrote, too; dozens of them were promising poets, each with his invocation to Antinous, his mournful descriptions of Venetian lagoons, his sonnets to a chorus girl in which he addressed her as "little painted poem of God." Most of this bustle would soon be overwhelmed in the vaster bustle of the War; but Cummings, like his friend Dos Passos, would have a different fortune. It was precisely the emotions evoked by the War which stimulated him into a period of enormous productivity.

The War, of course, was only a partial explanation: there were also technical reasons for his sudden flowering. The technical problem obsessing all the esthetes, in the midst of their simultaneous gestures toward sin and salvation, was that of originality—how, after three thousand years of written literature, to say anything new, or anything old in a new way. Many of them were inclined to deal with experiences so marginal as to have been neglected by writers of the past; others tried to achieve originality through scholarship, a department in which the modern writer can obtain an easy advantage over his predecessors. Neither of these solutions appealed to Cummings. Fundamentally he is a lyric poet, in the tradition, let us say, of Catullus and François Villon and Robert Burns. His message is their message: that life is vastly enjoyable, and the world beautiful in spring; that he loves Lady X or Madam Y as nobody has loved anybody; that "a pretty girl who naked is, is worth a million statues"; that death comes strolling through the April fields, "also picking flowers." About the time he sailed for France, early in 1917, he had discovered that these old truths could be expressed in other terms—those of "roses and locomotives (not to mention acrobats Spring electricity Coney Island the 4th of July the eyes of mice and Niagara Falls)." He was inventing a new language, an E. E. Cummingsese, in which he would soon be able to personalize the most familiar emotions. And War conspired with technique by conferring a new value on the commonplace.

Having sailed for France in April of the same year, I can remember moments when the senses were immeasurably sharpened by the thought of dying next day, or possibly next week. The trees about me were green, not like ordinary trees, but like trees in the still instant before a hurricane; the sky was a special and ineffable blue; the grass smelled of life itself; the image of death at twenty, the image of love, mingled together into a keen, precarious delight. It is the virtue of Cummings' poems to capture and accurately preserve the color of moments like this, to guard them from mutilation by the blunt hands of time, to save them from the cloudburst of shrapnel which, in another instant, will obliterate love and sky.

The five years after 1918 were a period of fertility which seems all the more remarkable when we reflect that Cummings devoted probably half of his working hours to painting or drawing, and that, during the remaining time, he completed "The Enormous Room," besides writing an uncomputable number of poems—more than enough, in any case, to fill the four books of verse he published between 1923 and 1926. Let us admit that the mere standard of quantity is meaningless: we have all known poets who could turn out four passable sonnets of an afternoon, and fall asleep in the evening over the twenty-seventh line of a ballade. The impressive thing about Cummings during those post-war years is not so much the number of poems he wrote as the number of his experiments, inventions, real discoveries. But periods like this, which occur in the lives only of fortunate poets, are likely to be of short duration. When verses no longer rouse the poet from sleep and write themselves before coffee in the morning, demanding only to be corrected; when fresh images no longer confront him like landscapes from a pullman window; when he has ceased to be the mere stenographer of the muses, he may possibly turn from poetry, as poetry has turned from him; or he may, on the other hand, go struggling consciously, by an effort of will, toward the greater achievements that lie in front of him. In the second case, what methods will he adopt, what direction will he follow?

To this question, "Viva" provides a sort of answer—neither heartening nor at all discouraging, not very definite, in fact, but still an answer.

The book contains seventy poems, some consisting of four lines, others of forty, but each of them printed on a separate page so as to present a separate picture. Thanks to the author's arrangement of lines and to S. A. Jacobs' typography, these pictures are generally pleasing. Every seventh page-picture, including the sixty-third, is a sonnet; the last seven form a group of sonnets. The poems were written in different years; many are obviously recent; more, perhaps, are older poems recently revised. Technically, they show a development toward a more arbitrary and geometrical use of language, toward greater ingenuity and complexity—in other words, toward the calligram and the cryptogram.

The word "calligram" has come to have a meaning hardly justified by its two Greek roots: it is applied to an arrangement of words that pictures the thing described, like the mouse's tale in "Alice." Poem XLV in the present volume deals, for example, with a man looking in winter through a dirty windowpane. The poem is printed in the shape of a diamond, like an old pane of glass. Poem XXXVIII describes a thunder shower, and its typography is lightning-jagged as it tells how the world "iS Slapped: with; liGhtninG." There have been critics who defended this aberrant typography on the ground of its being an aid to the reader—giving, as they say it gives, the exact timing and pronunciation of each word. But how, precisely, is one to pronounce "liGhtninG"? Or the word "n , o ; w:" occurring in the same poem—how can it be read aloud as written? The conclusion is that the typography of these words has no relation to the sound of

LICENSED TO OUP.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them; the effect intended is purely pictorial. They are more or less successful calligrams.

As for the cryptogrammatic tendency in Cummings' poems, it can generally be identified with his effort to be "simultaneous." Thus, instead of writing his sentences or phrases in their logical order, he is likely to divide two or three of them into fragments, which are then shuffled together and repeated in a single breath. Sometimes the device is wholly effective, as in the poem describing how he stood outside his door at twilight, with his lady, and watched a flying bat. The last lines read, when printed as prose, "i say 'won't you' (remembering) knowing that you are afraid 'go first' of dreams and little bats & mice (and you, you say 'let's' going in 'take hands' smiling 'coming up these dark stairs')." It requires no serious adjustment on the part of the reader to understand that the lady is not afraid of "go first," but merely of dreams and little animals. Sometimes, however, the poet offers a more difficult problem by dividing words instead of phrases, and by jumbling their parts like syllables drawn from a hat. The reader's perplexities are further increased by Cummings' trick of making some words serve two simultaneous purposes, of omitting other words entirely, and of writing whole phrases in a medium which Kenneth Burke described as "fonetty kinglish"—though here it is likely to be a more or less phonetic transcription of French words as currently pronounced in New York. It takes a deal of puzzling to decide that "Lays aytash unee" is simply "les Etats-Unis"; it takes more puzzling to discover that "the hoe tell days are teased" means something after all, being the name of the studio building on Sixty-seventh Street where Harry Crosby committed suicide. When these various forms of cryptography are combined with Cummings' tendency toward making calligrams, it is sometimes impossible to decipher the result.

But the general obscurity of Cummings' work is easy to exaggerate. In "Viva" there are only three poems—including the first—which baffled me completely. There are about a dozen others which had to be untangled like a fishing line. The remaining poems—fifty or more—should present no difficulty to the careful reader. It is quite possible, in fact, to write a criticism of Cummings without any reference to his famous unintelligibility.

He is a wit: this much is apparent in all his work, and one finishes "Viva" with the conviction that he is one of the wittiest poets in the English language. He is a satirist, too, as bitter and biting as anyone since Pope: witness his lines on the death of President Harding and his apostrophe to blond Olaf, the conscientious objector. He is depending more on anger—against politicians, officials, soldiers, against literary fakirs, against humanity in general—as a source of poetry. He is paying more attention to public matters like Einstein's theory and the Russian revolution, but his reaction to them remains private and unsocial. When (in "is 5") he describes a riot between Communists and policemen, his sympathy is with the first, but for reasons inacceptable to the Communists—because they "have very fine eyes. Some are young, some old, none look alike"; whereas the policemen, "tidiyum, are very tidiyum reassuringly similar." In general he remains the poet of love and death, of flowers under the April rain, of moments whose freshness can never be duplicated. More than ever, he is able to record these momentary emotions in memorable lines—iambic-pentameter lines, the most familiar and difficult medium in English. I doubt that any of his contemporaries could have written verses like these:

put off your faces, Death: for day is over
. . . . . .
day being come, Love, put on your faces.

prouder than all mountains, more than all
oceans various

the voice of your eyes is deeper than all roses
nobody, not even the rain, has such small hands.

This rebel, this innovator—and here is the paradox—is distinguished by his fidelity to the subject matter of lyric poetry through the ages, and by his ability to write in that heroic meter which has been the basis of English poetry since Chaucer. His experiments and inventions are in most cases too personal to be of service to other poets, except as a general example of courage. What chiefly impresses the reader of his best poems is the thought that he is perhaps the end of a great tradition.

There is at present no real doubt that lyric poetry is losing the vitality it once possessed. One would hesitate to say that it faces unfriendly criticism; hardly anybody bothers to attack it; the malady from which it suffers is lack of conviction on the part of its friends. Somehow the focus of interest has shifted. The question whether Miss Y and Mr. X will end by sleeping together still agitates the minds of individual poets, but they are coming to regard it as a private matter, not to be dignified with a memorable sonnet; either they translate their concerns into regions of high philosophy, like Mr. Eliot, or else they write about more public issues. I have known a poet somewhat younger than Cummings who discovered that he had irrevocably lost the woman in whom his life was centered; he stumbled home and wrote, with tears gumming the keys of his typewriter, an elegy on the death of Rosa Luxembourg. Once I asked him what he thought of Cummings. He said, "A fine poet, a very fine poet, but, I mean—there's nothing more up that street."

MALCOLM COWLEY.

The World at Work and Play

The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind, by H. G. Wells. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 2 vols. 924 pages. $7.50.

MANKIND at work and at play, being governed and being educated, loving, hating, bickering and bargaining, is the subject of this sweeping survey. It is intended, in the words of Mr. Wells, to represent *all* of the current activities and motives of the 1,900,000,000 souls who make up "the film of life" on this "planetary ant hill." It goes back to man's beginnings as an economic animal, to the domestication of animals and the origins of settlements and sustained work; it tells the story of how man has learned to think, how he has acquired ascendancy over forces and matter, how he has conquered distance, hunger and climate. It describes our extraordinary modern attempt to organize the production and the distribution of goods by the method of buying and selling. It tells how men are governed, it contains a history of leisure, it surveys the world of sport and entertainment, it describes how men are educated and disciplined, and it concludes with a discussion, in more or less cosmic terms, of the outlook for *homo sapiens*.

Perhaps the two words which best fit the book are "suggestive" and "stimulating." One cannot read a page without encountering arresting and penetrating observations,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without having one's prejudices challenged, one's imagination stirred, or one's mind set thinking in many directions. Perhaps it is too much to expect a survey which covers so much ground to be profound. The discussion of government, which is full of good things—for example, a superb description of the technique of fooling the people and an illuminating discussion of the permanent civil service—does not come to close grips with the essential problem of how wise public policies can be distilled from the opinions and prejudices of millions of ill informed and indifferent voters. Something far better than modern democracy should be invented, Mr. Wells feels, but he gives us little hint as to what it might be. More than half of the pages are devoted to a description of men at work—in other words, to economics—and this is the best part of the book. Nevertheless, Mr. Wells fails to get at the heart of our extraordinary economic system.

The dominant institution in modern industrial society is the market. We go to market to get a vast variety of decisions made for us: what shall be done with our savings —whether they shall go to expand already overdeveloped industries or to start new industries that are badly needed; how wealth and income shall be distributed; what shall be the hours of labor and the conditions of work. This is really an amazing way of getting decisions made. Certainly it is a clumsy and ineffective device for applying our steadily accumulating scientific knowledge to the decision of many economic questions. And yet so complete and so fatalistic has been our faith in the market that many business men tell us that there is no other satisfactory device for guiding industrial activity and, in fact, that any other procedure would interfere with "natural" law. Mr. Wells fails to apprehend the significance of the market and this means that he fails to make an attack upon the key problem of economics: namely, the adequacy of the market as a device for setting prices, distributing income and capital, determining working conditions and making all manner of economic decisions. Nowhere does he attempt to draw the line between the kind of decisions which can be satisfactorily made by this method and those which might better be handled by other machinery. Nowhere does he analyze how the market needs to be implemented in order to work more satisfactorily.

The book is a rich storehouse of widely diversified information, but the treatment of some topics is poorly informed. Mr. Wells adheres to the notion that the price level can be adjusted to index numbers by controlling the volume of bank credit, and that bank credit in turn can be controlled by manipulating interest rates. Within limits and under certain conditions this is true, but the narrowness of the limitations is daily becoming more apparent. Again Mr. Wells asserts that adherence to the gold standard will mean a progressive decline in prices. There are many reasons for doubting this conclusion, and there are others for believing that slow and creeping deflation would be far more desirable than the creeping inflation of prices which Mr. Wells proposes. Whether deflation stimulates or discourages enterprise depends upon the rate at which it occurs. *Slow* deflation is perhaps the most effective stimulus to technological change that can be devised and, because wages are a sluggish price, it has the additional advantage of being the most automatic way of increasing the purchasing power of those in the lower-income brackets. Its great drawback, of course, is that it creates in acute form the problem of technological unemployment.

Mr. Wells is amazingly optimistic. From prehistoric days, man has been dominated by the process of getting a living. He was tamed and domesticated by the necessity for toiling; he was tied down by his plowed fields and his accumulations of goods; more latterly he has been dominated by his machines, by the volatile currency and credit system, by the institution of profits and by a race of rapacious adventurers, called "captains of industry." And yet, despite this discouraging past, Mr. Wells envisages a sudden rationalization of our industrial system, a sudden subjection of our economic institutions to the service of society. The big business man as a powerful and irresponsible savage is a transitory phenomenon; he will be tamed by "the new education" (see Chapter I) which will create a new tradition—the tradition of the coöperative man—which in turn will transform the erstwhile "plunderers of profits" into "responsible economic aristocrats." The impending economic system is not described, but here and there we are permitted to glimpse its lines. It will be a world released from dependence upon a dancing monetary standard, a world in which a managed currency, under an international board of control, will hold the price level to an index number, in which consumption will be kept adjusted to production, in which the international board of control will apportion purchasing power to the various world services, including experiment and research, and in which the private investors, who now lose hundreds of millions each year by ill advised purchases, will become unnecessary.

Undoubtedly it is true that the world is on the eve of great economic changes. Among other things, we are probably entering the twilight of the gold standard. But where is the evidence that we are about to abandon economic nationalism for a world economic system? On the contrary, we seem to be entering a period of intensified nationalism. The gold standard is a form of international currency and this is one reason why it cannot survive in a world which is too nationalistic. But its passing will be a step backward rather than one in advance.

During the next decade gold will be restored in most countries which have abandoned it but, in a world of tariffs and trade barriers, the next major depression will probably again push many debtor countries off the gold standard. After this second experience, many countries will not return to gold. Instead there will be independent national-credit currencies. Exchange rates will fluctuate more or less violently, but this drawback to trade will be mitigated by speculation in exchange which will enable banks, importers and exporters to hedge. The new credit currencies are not likely (at least for many years) to mean a more stable price level in most countries, for few countries today are capable of managing a currency intelligently. Even the fluctuations in gold currencies during the last century were attributable, not solely to the metallic base, but in large degree to the management of the credit superstructure. All in all, the currency outlook for the next few decades is by no means a bright one. The main hope that we shall be spared this plunge into exaggerated nationalism is that Great Britain will possess the will and the skill to use her new tariff to initiate a cycle of reciprocal reductions in duties.

The world also appears to be drifting rapidly in the direction of controlled economies of some sort. This means that the next generation or two will be a period of industrial constitution-building no less momentous in its consequences than the period of constitution-making in the eighteenth century. No one can foresee what form the controlled economies will take, except that they are likely to be national economies and to differ in the form and methods of control according to the interests of the particular classes and groups which happen to be in the saddle. Here, indeed, we encounter the major question raised by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proposal of a controlled economy. Will our knowledge of economics and political science enable us to make such an economy broadly coöperative? Or is it bound to reflect the kind of control which is now represented on a national scale by the tariff and on a local scale by many of our city building codes—a control which, in the name of protecting some one or other, confers on a few groups the opportunity to milk the community? Although Mr. Wells is highly optimistic over the possibility of constructing a rational and genuinely coöperative economic system, yet he confesses that "the problem of government remains still the obscurest of all the vital problems that now challenge mankind." But does not the possibility of building a satisfactory controlled economy hinge upon our capacity to solve the riddle of good government? SUMNER H. SLICHTER.

Democritus Junior

Loquacities, by Charles M. Flandrau. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 232 pages. $2.50.

THE PRESENT reviewer first exercised his function upon Mr. Flandrau in the autumn of 1892. The author was then a sophomore at Harvard, attending a course conducted by that admirable critic and scholar, Professor Lewis E. Gates, whose assistant the reviewer was proud to be. Among the hundred and fifty fortnightly themes of the first assignment appeared a description of the desert seen from a dahabeah on the Nile, which seemed to offer no invitation to red ink. But stay! A line of camels was "silhouetted" against the sky. Silhouette as a noun, excellent word, but as a verb? "I silhouette, thou silhouettest, he, she or it silhouettes"? Clearly a case for consultation. "Permissible," thought Professor Gates, "but daring for a sophomore." On the card containing perhaps the first critical appraisal of Mr. Flandrau's talent, the reviewer wrote under the rubric diction, "daring."

Later Mr. Flandrau wrote some of the best stories of American college life, the only ones which we can place beside those of Mr. Compton Mackenzie, for example, in "Harvard Episodes" and "The Diary of a Freshman." Still later appeared "Viva Mexico," which is a classic. One asks, why not more? Why has the aptness for fiction, for description of places and people with the life still in them, been allowed to sleep?

The present volume gives the answer. Mr. Flandrau has been busy with his own life in St. Paul, with travel in many seas and lands. Glimpses of this experience may be caught among the sketches of "Loquacities." There is the reading of letters in "Yellowed with Age" which recall the eighteenth-century Irish background from which one branch of his ancestry emerged. There are memoirs of a boyhood in the Northwest in which Theodore Roosevelt appeared and left behind him "The Colonel's Hat." There is the old house, "the unostentatious Christian home," with the room which "has been my exclusive property ever since I was born." There is "the colt" of accidental illegitimacy which has attained the age of thirty-two. These impressions of permanence are mingled with those of wanderings which began at the age of eight. The picture of two little boys spending the day in the Gardens of the Tuileries, equipped with spades, pails and hoops, visiting the *guignol* once every afternoon, and making their way hand in hand across the Place de la Concorde undismayed by the terrific horse-drawn traffic, yields nothing to the accounts of Anglo-Saxon children in Paris in "Peter Ibbetson" and "Christopher," which have for Mr. Flandrau "a charm, a poignancy and a meaning that can be shared only by those who found out something of France at an age when they were not aware of the fact that they were finding out anything." Mexico appears in "Earthquakes" and "Jarana at Breakfast"; and "Arrival" is, it may be hoped, earnest money of the book on Majorca which has long been a promise.

"Loquacities," it will be clear, is the book of a personality which reveals itself in a style of candor and charm. Mr. Flandrau has preserved a type of humor which was a note (rare enough, it is true) of Harvard writing in the days when he was a daring sophomore, a kind of internal gaiety which wreathes the surface without breaking it. He may have caught something of it from Dr. Santayana, "at whose erudite and charming feet" he heard much of the "uniformity in multiplicity." Readers of The New Republic will appreciate the quality at once by a reference to Mr. Philip Littell, who was a legend at Harvard when Mr. Flandrau entered its portals. Like P. L., Mr. Flandrau is a master of the casual, the adventitious, the undesigned testimony of circumstances. It is in the spirit of the elder statesman that the daring sophomore confesses that his reason for going to Majorca was a limerick, since forgotten, which began "There was an old man of Majorca." It is almost the voice of P. L. which adds: "Old men whose activities are exploited according to this particular metrical formula are never, it seems, very nice old men—never refined Christian gentlemen exactly, whether they hail from Liberia, Algeria, or Spain; so no doubt it is just as well that I am unable to recall this one's claim to immortal infamy." ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Mr. Clemens' Family

My Father, Mark Twain, by Clara Clemens. New York: Harper and Brothers. 292 pages, illustrated. $5.

ONE OPENS a biographical work by a son or daughter of the central figure with misgivings, prepared for sentimentalism and a degree of eclectic dishonesty. Mark Twain's daughter has not offended in these respects, though she writes quite frankly as a hero worshiper.

She confines herself to the part of her father's life that she knew at first hand, she makes her chronicle intimate and familiar, she is circumstantial and refrains from critical estimates, and she does not shrink from adverting to his explosiveness of temper and his fond addiction to profanity. The hitherto unpublished letters are interesting in confirming the impressions gained from A. B. Paine as to his complete and affectionate domesticity; and they serve at the same time to correct the idea for which Howells, Paine and Brooks have been jointly responsible, that Mrs. Clemens' relation was in the least degree burdensomely repressive. His courtly devotion was unsurpassable.

Possibly the material for a correct understanding is to be found in his other biographies. But certain points are distinctly clarified in this portrait. One is the positive discomfort to which the family had to be subjected in the long period when he was struggling to pay the creditors of the Webster publishing company and recoup the fortune lost on the Paige typesetting machine. Another, not disregarded in Paine, is the immediate and immense impulse toward his subsequent pessimism given by the death of his daughter Susie, a visitation that was the more bitter because it occurred during his world-girdling lecture trip, undertaken in behalf of his creditors.

The book of reminiscences does not attempt character

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

analysis or esthetic criticism, but as an obviously honest and candid piece of work it provides data on which to confirm or modify the abundant literature of this sort. It was written by the daughter who seems to have been most like the father and helps to recreate the spirit and image of him.

PERCY H. BOYNTON.

Book Notes

BIOGRAPHY

JOHN JACOB ASTOR, by Kenneth Wiggins Porter. *Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 2 vols. 1,353 pages. $10.*

These scholarly volumes inaugurate the Harvard Studies in Business History sponsored by the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration under the editorial supervision of Professor N. S. B. Gras. Mr. Porter's exhaustive and definitive biography of America's first multimillionaire is more largely concerned with the record of Astor's multifarious business enterprises than with the personality of "the great Mandarin." Particularly valuable is the history of the organization and practices of our first great corporation—the American Fur Company—and the revelation of its political influence. With equal skill, but less spirit, Mr. Porter traces the history of Astor's Oriental trade and the relation of this to his real-estate speculations in Manhattan. Several hundred pages of letters, contracts, ledger books, invoices, deeds, and so forth provide an invaluable documentary history of an important chapter of American business.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: The Story of Victor Ilyitch Seroff, by M. R. Werner. *New York: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith. 277 pages. $2.50.*

Here is an inordinately interesting life, fully worth recording; one cannot be too grateful to the fates which threw together the young Russian musician and the American writer. Seroff's adventures and experiences in Russia, and in western Europe after his escape from Russia, are stimulating even when not concerned with the direct action of war and revolution. The narrator possesses a point of view and manages to extract entertainment from situations not necessarily entertaining in themselves, which to other eyes might have appeared tragic or even merely disgusting. This is particularly true of the section devoted to bohemian life in Paris, in which we are introduced to familiar figures at the Dôme, to American artists with too little money and to idle American women with too much. We are also vouchsafed a sympathetic glimpse of Isadora Duncan on the eve of her death.

CLASSICS AND TEXTS

THE DECAMERON OF GIOVANNI BOCCACCIO, translated by John Payne. *New York: Blue Ribbon Books. 528 pages. $1.*

The present volume of the Decameron is the most recent addition to this new series of illustrated classics. The book is well got up, its illustrations in the Rockwell Kent manner are above the average, the translation is the classical one of John Payne, and though the page carries two columns, the clear type and paper make that no serious drawback. In deference to the drug-store trade, or perhaps in spite of it, passages of a more exuberantly realistic nature are left in the original Italian. However, one must not expect all the roses and raptures of a limited edition in a popular series that costs only one twentieth as much.

CAESAR'S COMMENTARIES ON THE GALLIC WAR. The original text with literal interlinear translation and explanatory notes, by Frederick Holland Dewey. *New York: Translation Publishing Company. 500 pages. $2.*

Harried football players, trackmen, cheer leaders and other students prevented by their social and athletic duties from devoting more than a few minutes a day toward the accretion of knowledge, will find this interlinear translation of the "Gallic War" an invaluable aid in obtaining a C— in Latin IA. The literal translation, annotated with notes and copiously sprinkled with parenthetical bits of information—"*tela deficerent* (imp. subj.) *nostris* (dat.)"—offers in general a completely foolproof method of dividing Gaul into three parts with the minimum of intellectual effort. The present volume, however, is only one of a series—or should we call it a crowded stable?—of trots and ponies sponsored (or sired) by the same publishing house and guaranteed to haul the weary passenger in the omnibus of learning over the roughest passages of Xenophon, Ovid, Juvenal *et al.*

HISTORY

AN ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, by Edward Frank Humphrey. *New York: The Century Company. 639 pages. $3.75.*

The only fault that can justly be found with this book is that it attempts too much: the amount of detailed information it contains is amazing and oppressive; no merely human mind can retain it all, or even a large part of it. Aside from this cardinal fault, which is one of method, the author appears to have made every effort to present the facts of American economic history honestly and without bias. Speaking for himself alone, the reviewer is grateful for the excerpt from Alexander Hamilton's "Report on Manufactures," in which the great man expresses his satisfaction over the fact that in the new machine industry women and children can be employed with advantage and profit. He is equally grateful for the information that, during the Civil War, another great man, William Ewart Gladstone, "sought for profits from Southern investments, which may have influenced him when he made that celebrated Manchester speech wherein he maintained that Jefferson Davis had created a nation." In so vast a collection of facts and figures, the errors seem to be surprisingly few. The statement that in 1810 the iron furnaces were producing 53,000,000 tons a year contains three ciphers too many. In 1918 Mr. Charles Schwab was president of the Bethlehem, not the United States, Steel Corporation. That the Industrial Revolution created a new class of employers in England, the capitalists, is hardly true; there were capitalist employers in England since the sixteenth century, even industrial capitalists; Adam Smith, who wrote before the Industrial Revolution, knew them very well. That "most industrial laborers under the guild system never progressed beyond journeymen," is true of the declining days of the guilds, when they had hardened into monopolies, but not of their flourishing period. The contrasting statement that the American laborer of our day can, with industry and thrift, become a master of business and employer of laborers, will hardly be accepted as true by the generality of laborers. The rise from journeyman to master was of the essence of the guild system; the rise from laborer to capitalist is, even in America, the exception.

SCIENCE

THE UNIVERSE IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN PHYSICS, by Dr. Max Planck. *Translated by W. H. Johnston. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 114 pages. $2.*

The founder of the Quantum Theory devotes most of his book (which was originally a lecture given in 1929 before the University of Leyden) to a careful analysis of the philosophical and scientific implications of a physics which is getting farther and farther beyond the limits of ordinary perception and common sense. This introduces such major problems as reality, cause and law, free will and determination. The extreme refinement in physical technique and theory resulting from the pursuit of the atom leads Dr. Planck to suggest the somewhat Platonic view that "reality" is permanently inaccessible to human sense; while the purely statistical nature of electronic-wave phenomena plays havoc with the old concept of rigid "law." Nevertheless, Dr. Planck refuses to scrap the determinism which has always been a loyal ally of science, insisting that, if we can only strike deeply enough into "probabilities" we shall find the hard core of "dynamic, accurate and absolute laws." Granting that this, too, is metaphysics, it is at least a form of metaphysics which is proper to the ideals and methods

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fiction

BROOME STAGES, by Clemence Dane. *New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $3.*

It is appropriate that Clemence Dane's long genealogical novel about a stage dynasty which dominated the theatre in England and America from the middle-eighteenth century to the present day should first of all be good theatre. Her story justifies her claim that the members of this dynasty were the incarnation of romance and charm. Those two magics, so rare in contemporary fiction, flood the pages of this chronicle which, unlike most novels dealing with many generations, divides attention fairly among all the characters. The Broome family—not any individual Broome—is the hero, a treatment following naturally from Miss Dane's preceding family study, "The Babyons." The present novel repeats other characteristics of Miss Dane's earlier writings, especially her interest in experimenting with form, and confirms the suspicion, borne out by her plays, that despite so outstanding a novel as "Regiment of Women" her gift is essentially dramatic. "Broome Stages" is a colorful saga, rich in striking characterizations, brimming with picturesque episode, and thoroughly impregnated with an atmosphere the author knows by experience. But it is primarily good theatre.

THE LADY WHO CAME TO STAY, by R. E. Spencer. *New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.*

This first novel, modeled after some of the stories of Henry James—"The Turn of the Screw" or "Sir Edmund Orme"—invokes what James liked to call the "horrific." It is a careful copy; the style is much the same, superficially, as that of James's later novels, although the situation, a child exposed to the persecution of the ghost of an old woman and protected by the ghost of its mother, is presented unquestioningly as a conflict between good and evil, with none of James's ironic speculation on the nature of either. The best of James's stories of the supernatural are open to as many interpretations as they have readers, an important characteristic which Mr. Spencer, for all his devoted attention, does not imitate. "The Lady Who Came to Stay," though its workmanship is exceptionally careful and sustained, is essentially a horror story partially concealed beneath an elaborate and stylized prose.

Contributors

J. M. Keynes, the distinguished British economist, was the principal representative of the British Treasury at the Paris Peace Conference and deputy for the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Supreme Economic Council. His most recent books are "Treatise on Money," published last winter by Harcourt, Brace, and "Essays in Persuasion," just issued by the same firm.

Donald R. Murphy, as managing editor of Wallace's Farmer and The Iowa Homestead, has been in a peculiarly advantageous position to observe the changing economic attitude of the Corn Belt farmers.

Benjamin Ginzburg, author of "The Adventure of Science," contributor of philosophic, scientific and economic articles to various magazines, is at present at work on a volume of social philosophy.

Sumner H. Slichter is a professor of Business Economics at Harvard University and the author of a survey of the existing economic order, entitled "Modern Economic Society."

Percy H. Boynton, professor of English at the University of Chicago, is a compiler of much material for students of American literature and the author of a growing series of critical volumes on contemporary literature, the most recent being "The Challenge of Modern Criticism."

THE THEATRE GUILD presents EUGENE O'NEILL'S Trilogy

Mourning Becomes Electra

Composed of 3 plays
Homecoming, The Hunted, The Haunted
All 3 plays are presented on the same day, commencing at 5:30 sharp. Dinner intermission of one hour at 7:00.
No matinee performances
GUILD THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway

THE THEATRE GUILD presents

REUNION IN VIENNA

A Comedy by Robert E. Sherwood
MARTIN BECK Theatre, 45th St. & 8th Ave. PE—6-6100
Evenings, 8:40. Matinees Thursday, Saturday, 2:40

BENEFIT

AMERICAN ORT BENEFIT
(To aid the Jews of Central and Eastern Europe)
Metropolitan Opera House, Washington's Birthday Matinee, Feb. 22nd, at 2 P. M.

"LA JUIVE"

Rachel: ELIZABETH RETHBERG
Eleazar: GIOVANNI MARTINELLI

Dress Circle, $4.00; Orchestra Circle, $5.00 and $6.00; Orchestra, $7.50; Box Seats, $7.50, $10.00 and $12.50.
Mail Reservations to
WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION AMERICAN ORT
220 Fifth Avenue, New York City
Telephone: AShland 4-6684

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE

AT COOPER UNION
8th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, January 22
DR. RICHARD McKEON
"Thomas Aquinas: Reason and Experience."

Sunday, January 24
PROFESSOR CHARLES FLEISCHER
"Democracy on Trial."

Tuesday, January 26
PROFESSOR SHIRLEY QUIMBY
"Electricity."

MUHLENBERG BRANCH LIBRARY
209 West 23rd St., at 8:30 o'clock

Thursday, January 28
PROFESSOR E. G. SPAULDING
"Sensation the Gateway of Knowledge."

INVESTMENT COURSE
Elementary Survey Course
Investments and Modern Industry
Designed for Women Investors
Mondays: 7:30- 9:00, Jan. 25—Apr. 4
Tuesdays: 11:00-12:30, Jan. 26—Apr. 5
Wednesdays: 11:00-12:30, Jan. 27—Apr. 6
10 Lectures Fee: $15.00
551 Fifth Ave., at 45th St., 5th Floor
Clara I. Taylor Investment Counselor

The Most Profitable and least expensive way to pass the long winter evenings is correspondence with intelligent people. **CONTACTS**, the only correspondence club for mentally isolated intellectuals, connects you with unconventional, debunked free spirits. Particulars for 4c stamps from **CONTACTS**, 211 East 11th Street, N. Y. C.

MARY DE NIO
Teacher of Speech, also
Corrective Courses for Defective Speech
English for Foreigners
Studio: 601 W. 110th St. New York City
Telephone: Cath. 8-9846
Sat. and Sunday or Evenings after 6 o'clock

RESORT

Are you looking for a place to rest or work? Take a mid-winter vacation in our country home. Warm, attractive rooms, southern cooking, delightful open fires. Golf (no fees) walk in the woods, lounge in the sun.
MAJOR MARSHALL MACDONALD,
Media Farm
Charles Town, Jefferson Co., W. Va.
Rates: $15 a week and up

POSITIONS WANTED

Young Man would like responsible secretarial position, requiring initiative and adaptability. Preferably literary work but not essential. Free to travel. Address: Box 651, The New Republic.

Socialist who was forced to leave Hungary because of opposition to Horthy regime needs a job. Can speak and write French, German, Italian, Spanish, Hungarian, English. Will do any kind of work. Address: Box 652, The New Republic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED